DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 154 063 UD 018 080

TITLE 1977 Annual Report to the President and Congress; The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children.

INSTITUTION National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE 77

NOTE 100p.; For related documents see ED 037 520, ED 065 649, ED 08[illegible] 755, ED 133 403, and ED 133 407; Pages 91-96 may be marginally legible due to the print size in the original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; *Annual Reports; *Compensatory Education Programs; *Educational Improvement; Educational Practice; *Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Programs; *Program Administration; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation

IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

This report on progress in compensatory education reviews reports from various national assessment agencies. It attempts to ascertain the improvements made in compensatory education and identify areas where improvement is still needed. Specific issues discussed in the report include Federal, State and local administration, program effectiveness, fiscal management and national assessments. A major focus of the report is on developing legislative recommendations which will insure effective services under Federal law to educationally deprived children. In addition, this report comments on educational services provided to disadvantaged adolescents. Through direct involvement with educators, legislators, teachers, counselors, parents and students, the report examines, identifies, and defines the roles and responsibilities of educational institutions in preparing adolescent students for productive higher education and/or employment upon graduation. (Author/AM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED154063

EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED
ON THE EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED
COUNCIL ON THE EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED
NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

1977 Annual Report to the President and Congress

UD015080

The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children
425 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 1012, Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 724-0114

TITLE I—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec. 101. In recognition of the special educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational programs, the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in the following parts of this title) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

(20 U.S.C. 241a) Enacted April 11, 1965, P.L. 89-10, Title I, sec. 2, 79 Stat. 27; redesignated and amended January 2, 1968, P.L. 90-247, Title I, secs. 108(a) (2), 110, 81 Stat. 786, 787; amended April 13, 1970, P.L. 91-230, sec. 113(b) (2), 84 Stat. 126.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

Sec. 148. (a) There shall be a National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "National Council") consisting of fifteen members appointed by the President, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointment in the competitive service, for terms of three years, except that (1) in the case of initial members, five shall be appointed for terms of one year each and five shall be appointed for terms of two years each, and (2) appointments to fill vacancies shall be only for such terms as remain unexpired. The National Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman.

(b) The National Council shall review and evaluate the administration and operation of this title, including its effectiveness in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children, including the effectiveness of programs to meet their occupational and career needs, and make recommendations for the improvement of this title and its administration and operation. These recommendations shall take into consideration experience gained under this and other Federal educational programs for disadvantaged children and to the extent appropriate, experience under other public and private educational programs for disadvantaged children.

(c) The National Council shall make such reports of its activities, findings, and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this title) as it may deem appropriate and shall make an annual report to the President and the Congress not later than March 31 of each calendar year. Such annual report shall include a report specifically on which of the various compensatory education programs funded in whole or in part under the provisions of this title, and of other public and private educational programs for educationally deprived children, hold the highest promise for raising the educational attainment of these educationally deprived children. The President is requested to transmit to the Congress such comments and recommendations as he may have with respect to such report.

(20 U.S.C. 2411) Enacted April 11, 1965, P.L. 89-10, Title I, sec. 2, 79 Stat. 34; amended Nov. 3, 1966, P.L. 89-750, Title I, sec. 115, 80 Stat. 1197; redesignated and amended Jan. 2, 1968, P.L. 90-247, Title I sec. 108(a) (4), 110, 114, 81 Stat. 786-788; amended and redesignated April 13, 1970, P.L. 91-230, Title I, secs. 112, 113(b) (4), 84 Stat. 125, 126.

1977 Annual Report to the President and Congress

THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN
425 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 1012
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 724-0114

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Letter of Transmittal		iii
Executive Summary		1
Part I		
MINI REPORT		
Summary of Recommendations		5
Council Activities		7
Progress Report on Compensatory Education		58
Glossary		63
Part II		
LEGISLATIVE REPORT		
Introduction		67
Program Objectives and Funds Distribution		67
Federal Responsibility for Special Children		67
Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I Funding Formula		68
Individualized Needs Assessment		69
Parent Involvement		69
Citizen Participation		70
Evaluations and Technical Assistance		70
Title I Audits and Sanctions for Noncompliance		71
State Administrative Costs		72
Summary of Council Past Recommendations		73
Part III		
ADOLESCENT EDUCATION REPORT		
Introduction		77
Major Concerns		77
Characteristics of Effective Programs		78
Other Council Concerns		82
Summary and Conclusion		83
Part IV	*Appendices*	
STATISTICAL DATA		
National Title I Studies and Evaluations	A	86
State Funds for Compensatory Education	B	90
Formula Children Counted for FY 1977	C	91
Compensatory Education Funds: Federal Monies	D	92
Title I Allotments for FY 1977	E	93
Title I Allotments for FY 1976	F	94
Title I Allotments for FY 1975	G	95
Title I Allotments for FY 1974	H	96
Percent of Revenue Receipts by Source	I	97

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE EDUCATION
OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN
425 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 1012
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 724-0114

Dean Owen F. Peagler
Chairman—New York
Dr. Wilbur H. Lewis
Vice Chairman—Ohio
Mrs. Carol L. Schwartz
Vice Chairman—D.C.
Mr. John Calhoun
Maryland
Mrs. Mary Anne Clugston
New Mexico
Mr. J. Alan Davitt
New York
Mrs. Sarah Moore Greene
Tennessee
Mrs. Dorothy M. Fleegler
Florida
Mrs. Barbara Kilberg
Virginia
Mr. John Leopold
Hawaii
Mrs. Rosella E. Lipton
California
Mr. Marvin Pomerantz
Iowa
Mr. Ben Reifel
South Dakota
Dr. George Willeford
Texas
Mr. M. Alan Woods
Virginia
Mrs. Roberta Lovenheim
Executive Director

March 31, 1977

Dear Mr President:

I am pleased to transmit the 1977 Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children.

The Federal role in elementary and secondary education in the United States has been firmly established since the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. During that 12-year period, Title I of the Act has led to the development and refinement of compensatory education and its basic components of comparability, needs assessment and parent involvement. Many of the new developments designed to improve the education of disadvantaged children have been successful and have initiated institutional changes that have improved educational services to all children.

ESEA will terminate in September 1978. The 1977 Annual Report and recommendations are intended to provide useful information and well-considered recommendations for current legislative and policy deliberations. The framing of the key recommendations were undertaken in consultation with a variety of citizens, groups and practitioners. The Council included its experience with the statutory monitoring of the NIE Compensatory Education Study and the court ordered participation in the landmark Barrera vs. Wheeler case in Missouri.

The Council meets one statutory obligation through the transmittal of this 1977 Annual Report. It continues to provide the Congress advice and data throughout the year, and we welcome that responsibility.

The members appreciate the opportunity to serve educationally disadvantaged children through the advisory role and to render timely and pertinent advice to the members of Congress and the President.

Respectfully submitted,

Owen F. Peagler

Owen F. Peagler
Chairman

The President of the United States
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act authorizes federal financial assistance for programs designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children residing in areas with high concentrations of children from low income families. The program is administered by Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children annually examines the effectiveness of this Title and submits reports to the President and the Congress on its findings and recommendations.

This year, the Council has emphasized legislative issues relating to the reauthorization of Title I. It has additionally identified common characteristics of educational programs which have been favorable in meeting the special needs of disadvantaged adolescent students.

The local nature of Title I programs required the Council to generate considerable citizen involvement as a prerequisite to its independent and objective review. The Council explored issues, examined concerns and obtained information through meetings with administration and congressional members; state and local officials; and parents and students; as well as through site visits, conferences, seminars and workshops. Activities were planned to focus on legislative issues, adolescent compensatory education, program assessments and parent involvement. The committee structure was designed to fully utilize the Council members' areas of expertise.

The report on progress in compensatory education examines many of the current areas of program administration and operation raised at the federal, state and local levels. The Council has reviewed reports from various national assessment agencies and additionally solicited broad citizen involvement from local program personnel, parents and other interested parties. It has attempted to ascertain the improvements made in compensatory education and identify areas where improvement is still needed. Specific issues discussed in this report include federal, state and local administration, program effectiveness, fiscal management and national assessments.

The Council's major focus for this report year was on developing legislative recommendations which would insure effective services under federal law to the educationally deprived children.

Legislation follows a dynamic pattern. Statutes change to circumstances as perceived by enlightened leadership. The Council believed that basic to its advice to the President and the Congress should be recommendations of characteristics inherent in any legislation intended to benefit the educationally disadvantaged.

This report has been developed in anticipation of administrative and congressional consideration of Title I legislation prior to the expiration of the current law. The review of these recommendations is derived from the fundamental focus of the Council that the needs of the child are paramount; that the child is the purpose and reason for the law. These recommendations are not necessarily new; many of them are in the present law and are reflected in this report to highlight their importance.

As an additional focus for this report year, the Council sought to articulate current concerns and desired modifications of the educational services provided to disadvantaged adolescent students.

Through direct involvement with educators, legislators, teachers, counselors, parents and students, attempts were made to examine, identify and define the roles and responsibilities of educational institutions in preparing adolescent students for productive higher education and/or employment upon graduation. In addition, the Council sought to gain the broadest possible range of ideas in order to seek remedial and alternative educational priorities which would provide more practical and productive ways of delivering adequate educational services to all adolescents.

The section examines many of the current issues in educational programs for adolescents and highlights those instructional techniques and administrative practices most beneficial in developing positive learning attitudes and achievement in the necessary basic skills.

Compensatory education faces a thorough examination of its effectiveness during the reauthorization of Title I. Issues which will influence the decision-making process and are further discussed in this report are:

- the interest of parents and students in demanding accountability from local educational agencies in terms of competency, proficiency and employability;

- declining enrollment in local educational agencies which generates opportunities for varieties of services;

- deregulation requirements generated from public fatigue with federal red tape imposed on both the legislative and executive branches of the federal government;

- formula for allocation criteria;

- the effectiveness of compensatory education programs in raising the educational attainment of educationally disadvantaged students, and whether any gains made are sustained;

- institutionalized factors which predict and create educational disadvantagement among children from low income families;

- the reliability of tests as demonstrators of competence and as indicators for formula options;

- the provision of educational services to children in state and local institutions;

- the provision of educational services to children in rural families, especially children of migrant workers;

- the provision of educational services in a coordinated mechanism to children from American Indian families; and,

- the degree of mandated parental involvement in federal programs providing educational services.

Part I

MINI REPORT

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS 1977

LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children recommends that:

ESEA Title I Funding

- federal funds for services to the educationally disadvantaged continue to be distributed to states and local educational agencies on the basis of economic criteria and then utilized within the eligible program locations on the basis of highest educational need.

- the funding formula be revised to simplify economic criteria and collection of statistical data on poverty children; provide uniform criteria and appropriate allocation procedures for local districts whether organized on a state, county or district basis; and, provide adequate allocations to urban areas with high concentrations of low income families.

- a differential in allotment for Alaska, Hawaii and the territories to address extreme disparities of costs in providing services comparable to those provided in the contiguous states, such a distinction shall reflect the current cost of living differential for federal employees.

- the minimum floor be raised to $250,000 for administrative costs for meeting the federal requirements in the management of Title I at the state level.

- U.S. Office of Education technical assistance funding be restored to a level no less than the FY 1974 activity level to insure its ability to offer specific technical assistance.

- there be a limitation on the use of Title I funds for support services.

- funds allocated for national evaluations be reduced.

ESEA Title I Program Objectives

- the primary objective of Title I programs be to raise the educationally disadvantaged child's level of achievement in the basic skills (reading, mathematics, and language arts).

- funds originally designated for educational objectives not be utilized for the delivery of social services through educational channels.

Compensatory Education Evaluations

- in order to receive useful information, congressional authorizations for evaluations and studies of the effects of compensatory education state specific objectives and realistic timetables for the projects authorized.

- national evaluation efforts be limited to developing uniform Title I program standards, evaluation instruments and reporting procedures.

ESEA Title I Program Administration

- the U.S. Office of Education employ a firm cutoff date by which accurate data must be received for Title I allocations.

- the Federal Government exercise a direct responsibility for special groups of children (migrant, nonpublic, American Indian, neglected and delinquent) where local and state obligation is not acknowledged or existent.

- Health, Education, and Welfare Title I audit policies be revised to (1) reduce unnecessary paperwork; (2) resolve audit exceptions in a timely manner; and, (3) confine audit activities to compliance with federal requirements.

- federal legislation require state plans which

incorporate an individualized educational plan.

- Title I legislation require an individualized needs assessment.

- Congress amend 20 United States Code 1232(g) to require the Commissioner of Education to publish rules, regulations, and guidelines of any new legislation affecting educationally disadvantaged children within 120 days after enactment, rather than the 240 days as presently stated.

- the use of Title I funds for capitol construction of facilities be specifically prohibited.

Parent and Citizen Involvement

- any compensatory education legislation contain components which provide for a direct involvement of the parents in an advisory role to the overall program serving their children.

- legislation encourage citizen participation at the state and local educational level to facilitate the planning, monitoring and evaluation of Title I programs.

Adolescent Education

- Congress give more attention to the common characteristics of program effectiveness and they be utilized in determining policy for adolescents; individualized education plans; work experience programs; expanded vocational education programs; alternative programs for potential dropouts; guidance and career counselors with specific roles; peer tutoring; and meaningful parent involvement.

- federal legislation require state plans to incorporate work experience opportunities for adolescent youth.

ADMINISTRATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children recommends that:

ESEA Title I Technical Assistance

- technical assistance activities be considered crucial to the ongoing improvement in Title I programs.

- local school districts be encouraged to provide parents with the effective assistance necessary to carry out their advisory roles.

Adolescent Education

- educational programs serving disadvantaged adolescents include institutional techniques utilizing some of the following characteristics;
  - individualized education plans;
  - work experience programs;
  - expanded vocational education programs;
  - alternative programs for potential dropouts;
  - guidance and career counselors with specific roles;
  - peer tutoring;
  - meaningful parent involvement.

- school curricula and instructional techniques be made flexible and realistic for youth in junior and senior high schools.

- state educational agencies be encouraged to investigate all possibilities of establishing work experience programs for disadvantaged youth.

- priority be given to the expansion of quality vocational education programs.

- youth be given an opportunity to acquire skills and knowledge in a variety of program settings.

- guidance services be a totally planned program in each school district and the NACEDC further recommends that students, counselors, mental health professionals, teachers, parents, and administrators participate as a team in providing adequate services to youth.

- more emphasis on peer-group tutoring be encouraged to reinforce basic skills and build self-esteem among educationally disadvantaged youth.

- parent education be encouraged in the junior and senior high schools.

- parent involvement be extended to influence the education of the adolescent child.

- local school districts be encouraged to provide parents with the effective assistance necessary to carry out their advisory roles.

- the high school diploma be based on competency and awarded only upon attainment of a recognized level of accomplishment by the student.

- parents and students be included in the task force developed to prescribe minimum standards of accomplishment for high school graduation.

- minimum standards be set sufficiently high not to dilute the value of the high school diploma.

- more youth-adult community guidance centers be established as family counseling agents in conjunction with services and planning with ongoing public and private institutions.

- school officials encourage school guidance departments to give priority to disseminating realistic information as well as expectations concerning post secondary opportunities to students with special educational needs.

- school officials be encouraged to minimize testing and maximize instructional time during a given school year.

COUNCIL ACTIVITIES

Introduction

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides resources to about 14,000 local educational agencies. This is the largest federal program for educational assistance with an annual budget of $2.2 billion in fiscal year 1976. As a state and local entitlement program, Title I is administered at all three levels of government.

Title I serves as a catalyst for the local educational agencies to provide *extra* services to raise the educational attainment of a target population of children. Local involvement is the key element in the design of effective programs and services. The variety of programs implemented across the nation demonstrates a broad range of program effectiveness and community enthusiasm.

The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children (NACEDC) reviews and evaluates the implementation of the array of services provided by Title I, and comments on their effectiveness to the President and the Congress.[1] Due to the local nature of the program, it is essential for a proper review to generate substantial citizen comment. The NACEDC plans for citizen involvement in preparing its activities and includes their views in its deliberations.

Council Activities

The process for developing the Annual Report involved regular council meetings, on-site visits, seminars, and member participation in activities. In some instances, the NACEDC program was structured to gather information for identifying

successful programs.[2] In other instances it relied on the judgment and advice of specialists in the appropriate fields.

The findings and recommendations of this report are the result of contributions from each level of Title I program involvement.

Congress and its staff have utilized the Council by requesting informal comments and written testimony on legislation. Specific recommendations have been sought on matters pertaining to migrant children, parent involvement, maintenance of effort, vocational education and consolidation of grants.

Individual citizens and education professionals submitted comments and inquiries throughout the year. Administrators often expressed concern over funding, the "bureaucratic red tape" and the problems encountered on data requested on local program effectiveness. Teachers raised questions concerning the degree to which class size and individualized instruction make a difference reaching program goals. Parents and students often attack the failure of the traditional educational institutions to adequately prepare students for advanced education, gainful employment, or both.

Site visits are conducted by the NACEDC to observe state and local administration and operation of Title I and related educational programs serving the disadvantaged population. Each year programs are identified which are raising the educational attainment of disadvantaged students.

This year many of these visits focused on educational programs for adolescent students. Visits included assessing programs for out-of-school job training and remedial education; migrant summer education programs in Delaware; Indian Education programs utilizing various resources in North and South Dakota; dropout prevention and vocational education programs in Ohio; and occupational preparation centers in California.[3] This information along with informal discussions and correspondence is incorporated into the report section on adolescent education.

In report year 1977 the NACEDC was requested by the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals in St. Louis, Missouri, to make recommendations on state criteria for the provisions of Title I services to eligible nonpublic school children. An ad hoc committee visited with state and local school officials as well as nonpublic school representatives and parents from St. Joseph, St. Louis, Kansas City, and Jefferson City, Missouri, while conducting its fact-finding review. After careful examination of the issues, the committee made a report to the Council which is in the process of finalizing its response to the Court. Also, upon request from the U.S. Office of Education, the Council provided its initial report to federal officials.

Public Law 93-380 requires the NACEDC to advise the National Institute of Education on its studies of compensatory education programs. Periodically the NACEDC comments on the progress of these studies and makes recommendations for improvements. These studies were the subject of two interim reports.[4]

Members are designated to serve in an advisory capacity on panels and task forces studying the effectiveness of compensatory education programs. These groups are examining issues such as noninstructional services, migrant education, alternative designs of compensatory education programs, state evaluation models, and early childhood education.[5] In addition, the staff represents the NACEDC on the Federal Interagency Committee on Education.

The NACEDC noted that parents have increased and strengthened their involvement with Title I administrators and program directors. This relationship is further extended to the national, state and regional levels. The Council encourages parent/administrator interaction by requesting interviews with local parent advisory council members and other parents during the NACEDC site visits.

A continuing liaison is maintained with a broad spectrum of individual citizens and interest groups made up of parents, school board members, chief state school officers, and representatives of private and public organizations. An exchange of ideas with interested parties on pending legislation is an ongoing process as each seeks to respond to issues relating to educational programs.

The NACEDC had consistently observed that those on the local level, closest to the children, are best equipped to evaluate their needs. The local administrators must bear the responsibilities if a valid picture of measuring the effectiveness of compensatory education is to be obtained. Meaningful assessment of student achievement cannot be measured by tests alone, but such measurement must be supplemented by

other means of evaluation.

In addition, the NACEDC has perceived that the total educational community is generally willing and does work effectively together. This team approach is beneficial in setting the best possible objectives for providing educational services not only to the disadvantaged but the student population as a whole. When specific roles are clearly defined for educational administrators, teachers and parents, results are evident.

The programs and projects described in this report were visited and identified as demonstrating the validity of the foregoing observations. They represent a variety of compensatory education programs, federally and nonfederally funded which hold high promise of raising the educational attainment of disadvantaged children.

The Council's criteria for determining successful programs include:

- reading scores;
- mathematics scores;
- school attendance;
- reported discipline problems; and
- parent attendance at school meetings and activities

The objectives and goals of these programs were designed to meet the special educational needs of disadvantaged youth in their specific geographic areas. Included were programs/projects in both urban and rural school districts serving a variety of ethnic and cultural groups. Due to time and budget restrictions only a limited number of site visits were undertaken. Those programs and projects displayed to a large extent the characteristics identified by the NACEDC as yielding positive results in serving the disadvantaged child.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Public Law 89-10, Sec. 148 (b) ESEA Title I.
[2] Site Visit Reports, pages I-12–I-55.
[3] *Ibid.*
[4] "Can We Stand Deficient Evaluations," NACEDC Interim Report to the Congress, January 1976; NACEDC Interim Report, January 1975.
[5] Council Related Activities, 1976-77, pages I-57–I-60.

Program Title:	Southern California Regional Occupational Center
Location:	Torrance, California
Duration:	1976-77
Number Served:	16,600 students
Grade Range:	Grades Eleven and Twelve
Ethnicity:	20 percent Black 20 percent Spanish-American 60 percent White 1/2 percent American Indian 2 percent Oriental
Area Served:	Urban
Source of Funding:	60 percent local (Eleven communities) 40 percent State Department of Education
Expenditure:	$1300 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program:	Improve and expand the vocational training opportunities available to youth in attendance in area high schools and adults out of school.
Objectives:	Produce salable skills in students taking the occupational centered curriculum.
Context:	Serving youth and adults in the South Bay area of Los Angeles County encompassing fourteen cities and unincorporated areas and six school districts.

Program Description:

The curriculum is designed to help all enrollees develop the skills, knowledge and attitudes necessary to obtain a job entry skill in the occupational area of their choice. It is a success-oriented, individualized curriculum based on a thorough job market analysis and job task analysis from which terminal performance objectives are established for each program. The staff works closely with local employers in establishing and maintaining viable occupational training programs. All trainees receive a performance profile upon leaving the center indicating their job entry competencies in their chosen field. Most trainees also receive Certificates of Proficiency certifying completion of the majority of objectives in a given program.

Beginning with medical and dental assisting, major appliance repair, welding, data processing equipment operation, keypunch and business procedures, the program expanded to include automotive repair, electricity/electronics and machine tooling. Most recently, facilities expanded to include emergency medical care training, hospitals services, advertising design, technical drafting and computer programing. Academic instruction is also stressed.

Personnel:

The total staff numbers 180, with about 50 percent serving in professional capacities. The faculty/student ratio is twenty to one.

Parent Involvement:

Each individual school has parent advisory councils. The center has heavy community involvement with advisory committees consist-

ing of experts in each field. These experts assume responsibility for finding employment for students wherever possible.

Results:

Forty percent of the students entered the full-time job market upon completion of the program; 21 percent continued high school; three percent entered part-time labor; 30 percent entered college; two percent entered the military; one percent became housewives; and about six percent are unemployed.

Of those enrollees entering the full-time labor market, 81 percent used their training in the same field or a related field. Of those enrollees out of high school, 73 percent used their training either in the labor market or as a major in college.

Contact Person:

Dr. Walsh, Program Director
Southern California Regional Occupational Center
Torrance, California 90501
(213) 320-6700

Program Title:	*Project 70001, Ltd.
Location:	Wilmington, Delaware
Duration:	1976-77
Number served:	120 young people
Age range:	16-22 years of age
Participants served:	High school dropouts
Area served:	Urban
Source of Funding:	National Program Division, Department of Labor Local School District Mayor's City Comprehensive Employment Training Act Comprehensive Employment Training Act - County Funds Vocational Education Amendments
Expenditures:	$1,000 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program:	Close the gap between education and work by combining on-the-job work experience and classroom General Education Diploma, (GED) instruction with a structured program of vocationally related youth activities.
Objectives:	Prepare young people for full-time unsubsidized employment in the private sector which will lead to a productive and rewarding career.
Context:	70001, Ltd., located at Price's Corner Shopping Center in Wilmington, Delaware, serves the youth of that area who have dropped out of school. The male/female ratio served is equal. Ninety percent of the enrollees are unemployed, unskilled and receive some form of public assistance.

Program Description:

Project 70001, Ltd., is a program of unsubsidized employment, on-the-job training and personal motivation and growth that prepares out-of-school young people for careers primarily in distribution.

*(Project 70001 Ltd. is located in seventeen areas across the country. The NACEDC visited one of the national program locations.)

The education component includes an individualized self-pacing audio-visual instructional program developed especially by 70001, Ltd., to meet specific needs of its enrollees.

The program includes an orientation assessment, evaluation and testing. Based on this assessment pre-employment training (90 days) is begun including vocational instruction, training for a general education diploma (GED) and self-confidence building activities. The educational component continues after job placement with training scheduled around work hours. Educational training is meshed with job training to build necessary skills for job retention and advancement. Students remain until they receive the general education diploma (GED), usually

about six months.

Personnel:

The personnel include:

Full-time Professionals
Program Manager
County CETA Coordinator
City CETA Coordinator
Reading Teacher
Vocational Education Coordinator.

Results:

Approximately 66 percent of the enrollees had been placed on jobs and the remainder were preparing for employment. The three year pilot program indicated that 71 percent of the enrollees stayed on the job at least one year. Fifty percent of all those employed surpassed the comprehensive employment training act "permanent placement" regulation of ninety (90) consecutive days of employment.

Contact Person:

Mr. Kenneth Smith
National Director
Project 70001, Ltd.
151 Chestnut Hill Road
Newark, Delaware 19711
(302) 731-0750

Program Title:	Migrant Summer Educational Programs
Location:	Smyrna, Delaware
Duration:	July and August, 1976
Number Served:	110 students
Grade Range:	Kindergarten through Grade Six
Ethnicity:	Ninety-two Blacks Eighteen Mexican-Americans
Area Served:	Rural
Source of Funding:	ESEA, Title I
Expenditure:	$593 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program:	Provide educational continuity for migrant children during summer months.
Objectives:	Each target area student will increase his reading vocabulary by ten to twenty words; and mathematics skills by one to two months. Each student will increase his reading comprehension skills by one to two months.
Context:	The program is located in an elementary school and serves local migrant camps in the area operating for six weeks—early July through mid-August.

Program Description:

Migrant children are recruited as they arrive in the state for this program. Services provided include: physical examinations upon entry, extended day care services, transportation and free meals each day. Classes begin at 8:00 a.m. and dismiss at 7:00 p.m. Two shifts of personnel are utilized to accommodate the lengthened day's services.

The program features daily word recognition periods, reading labs, self-selected library and trade books, accompanied with story periods in classrooms. Concept development is emphasized. Material is summarized and children learn to follow sequential development.

Mathematics labs, selected text materials, mathematics tapes and filmstrips are used for instruction.

Personnel:

Project personnel consists of: a project director, eleven teachers, and a part-time psychologist, visiting teacher, and nurse.

Parent Involvement:

The summer program has an active parent advisory council which reviews the summer's project and makes recommendations for its continuation and improvement. Parents are involved in field trips and as tutors.

Results:

All students made gains in the basic skills areas based on pre-and-post test results during the six week period.

Contact Person:

Mrs. Arlene Scanlon
Migrant Coordinator

Capital School District
State Department of Public Instruction
Townsend Building
P. O. Box 697
Dover, Delaware 19901
(302) 678-4667

Program Title:	Production Work Center and Bindery Sheltered Workshops
Location:	Parma, Ohio
Duration:	1976-77
Number served:	12-15 at one time
Age range:	16-18 years of age
Ethnicity:	Ukranian, Hungarian, Black, Italian, Polish, Slovenian, Slovak
Area served:	Urban
Source of Funding:	Federal (PL 89-210, PL 90-576) - 75 percent Local - 25 percent
Expenditure:	$800 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program:	Develop each student's personal, social and work skills to the highest possible level and to help each student become employed in a full-time job.
Objective:	To mass produce products while teaching personal, social and work skills which evaluation has shown must be developed before students can be employed.
Context:	Serves 16-18 years old handicapped and disadvantaged students.

Program Description:

This program does not have a definite length of time in which it is to be completed. The Production Work Center and Bindery produces products while emphazing the personal, social and work skills that evaluations have shown need to be developed before students can be employed.

The Book Bindery is the more advanced program serving approximately the same number of students. This program is for more capable students and also develops personal, social and work skills. Students completing this program frequently are mainstreamed into regular vocational programs.

Personnel:

Instructors have industrial work experience in production type occupations. They conduct their shops similar to that of small industries with the instructor acting in the role of an employee as well as teacher.

Parent Involvement:

Parents are always consulted and counseled prior to the student's enrollment into these programs. In addition, they are kept informed as to the student's progress and frequently called upon to assist with certain behavior changes.

Results:

Vocational evaluation, training and job placement is the ultimate goal for every disadvantaged and handicapped student enrolled in the Parma Schools. In order to implement this goal, a variety of programs and alternatives have been developed for this purpose since 1969. The present program requires the cooperation of five departments in order to implement individualized vocational plans for these students. The five

departments presently cooperating in this effort are: Special Projects, Special Education, Vocational Education, Industrial Arts, and Counseling.

Through these programs, students graduating a few years ago without vocational training or a job are now being placed in jobs for which they have been trained. Placement is made prior to graduation so that follow-ups can be made to insure their success. These students are becoming economically independent.

Contact Person:

Mr. Donald O'Dell
Project Director
Parma City School District
(216) 842-5300

Program Title:	Secondary Program for Vocational Assessment and Evaluation of Handicapped and Disadvantaged Youth
Location:	Parma, Ohio
Duration:	1976-77
Number served:	50-75 students
Age range:	16-18 years of age
Ethnicity:	Italian, Black, Slovak, Slovenian, Polish, Ukranian, Hungarian
Area served:	Urban
Source of Funding:	Federal (PL 88-210, PL 90-576) - 75 percent Local - 25 percent
Expenditure:	$500 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program:	Properly assess and evaluate the vocational potential and interest of the students.
Objectives:	Provide hands-on work related experiences. Explore wide variation of job interest for students as related to the Dictionary of Occupational Titles.
Context:	Program serves 16-18 year old handicapped and disadvantaged students.

Program Description:

Although 50-75 are served each year, only 30 students are in the program at one time. The Evaluation Center evaluates the vocational potential and interest of the handicapped and disadvantaged through hands-on and work related experiences. Students are in the program three hours per day, five days per week for up to four weeks. In the program students are given an opportunity to explore their interest in a wide variation of job interests which are directly related to the Dictionary of Occupational Titles. At the completion of the program a meeting is held and a vocational plan is developed for each student in consultation with the work evaluations, counselor, parent, and student.

Personnel:

The Vocational Evaluator has experience in industrial education and in the field of industry, in addition to special training as a vocational evaluator.

Parent Involvement:

Parents are consulted before students are enrolled in the program. Parents are also involved in the "staffing" which is held following evaluation, to develop the student's individualized vocational plan.

Results:

Each student completing evaluation is "staffed" by eight to ten professional staff members, in addition to the parents. An individualized vocational plan is developed using one or more of the following alternatives:

—Mainstreamed into a regular vocational

program
- —Mainstreamed into Industrial Arts, non-vocational business, or Home Economics
- —Immediate full-time employment
- —On job training in a part-time job
- —Work adjustment program (either Bindery or Production Work Center)
- —Try-out in one of the various Industrial Arts, Home Economics, or Business courses for one or two marking periods
- —None of the above as a result of physical, mental, or maturity development

Periodic review of students placed in each of the alternatives listed above is made and students not succeeding are re-staffed to determine changes to be made.

As a result of this program, handicapped and disadvantaged students are receiving vocational training and are being placed in jobs which provide opportunities for them to become economically independent.

Contact Person:

Mr. Donald O'Dell
Project Director
Parma City School District
(216) 842-5300

Program Title	*Transition Project (Thirteen public and five nonpublic junior high schools)
Location:	Cleveland, Ohio
Duration:	1976-77
Number Served:	900 students
Grade Range:	Grade seven
Ethnicity:	Approximately 90 percent Black Seven percent White Two percent Spanish-American One percent Other
Area Served:	Urban
Source of Funding:	ESEA, Title I
Expenditure:	$820,590 for total project

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program:	Attempt to help participating seventh grade students make a successful adjustment into secondary school.
Objective:	Improvement in academic skills in reading, mathematics, and social studies; a strengthening of personal and social adjustment; strengthened communication between home and school.
Context:	Assists students who have tested below 33rd percentile on standardized tests in reading and mathematics in the sixth grade and who are in Title I schools.

Program Description:

This program has special supportive services and an enriched curriculum, stressing reading and mathematics with an emphasis on grouping and individualized instruction.

Students spend a portion of the school day in a three period block of time which includes social studies, reading-English, and mathematics. During the reading-English period, ten to twelve students work in the reading lab in specific skill areas. The team leader and educational aide remain in the block time room to work with the rest of the class in various reading-English skills.

Transition students have a skills reinforcement period scheduled outside the block time. The team leader and educational aide work with students individually and/or in small groups on basic reading and mathematics skills.

Personnel:

Each Transition class involves the following personnel: a team leader certified in English and/or Social Studies; resource teachers in reading, mathematics, science, vocational education, and physical education; paraprofessional educational aides; and, a part-time guidance counselor.

Parent Involvement:

There is a strong liaison between the home and the school due to the home visits made by educational aides. This helps maintain a high

* The NACEDC visited one of these transition projects—the Franklin D. Roosevelt Junior High School Transition Project.

attendance record and increases parental involvement. Organized parental involvement includes local Parent Advisory Councils, a Transition City-Wide Parent Advisory Council and a Title I City-Wide Parent Advisory Council. Monthly meetings provide an explanation of program goals, clarification of staff roles, and a knowledge of available community resources. In addition, the Transition City-Wide Council provides input to proposal planning. Parents are asked for their views on the needs of their children and are encouraged to give suggestions to insure the establishment of a more flexible program to meet those needs.

Results:

A marked acceleration in progress rate over a six month pre-post testing period in the following areas: reading vocabulary: mean pre-post gain of ten months; reading comprehension: mean pre-post gain of six months; computation skills: mean pre-post gain of ten months.

Attendance rates of Transition students exceeded that of the total grade seven attendance. Completion rates for classwork and homework showed a marked improvement also.

Contact Person:

Mrs. Patricia Mathews
Program Manager
Transition Project
2104 E 30th Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 687--817

Program Title:	Vocational Information Program, Inc. (VIP)
Location:	Cleveland, Ohio
Duration:	1976-77
Number served:	80 students
Grade range:	Ninth grade
Ethnicity:	Black
Area served:	Urban
Source of Funding:	Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund: State of Ohio Compensatory Funds
Expenditures:	$623 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program:	Helping minority youth take their rightful place in society through education, individualized training and personal development.
Objectives:	Helping the participant fit in the vocational field to decide what he will do and how he will excel.
Context:	Students can be high achievers or potential dropouts who have expressed an interest in a vocational field.

Program Description:

This two year program, in addition to the regular junior high school curriculum, has a heavy curriculum slanted toward success in the work world. Tours through various industries after hearing lectures and discussions to prepare them for the visit are part of the program. Speakers and experts are invited into the classroom. Films, visual aides and brochures make the visit meaningful.

Each Saturday morning during the school year, students meet at the junior high school for individual attention in English, including communication and comprehension, and mathematics. The tutors are businessmen, secretaries, teachers, chemists, foremen, engineers, physicists, training directors, university professors and students from the local community.

In early spring, questionnaires are mailed by the students detailing their job preferences for local employers to seek a job fit. Follow-up calls are made to secure positions for boys in various industries. This junior internship helps the students learn and experiment with an occupation the pupil might like to pursue and also gives an opportunity to earn money after school and during summer and vacation periods.

Personnel:

The personnel include:
One paid coordinator, in four hours per week
75 Volunteers recruited from businesses; communities and the Volunteer Information Program alumni; and retired teachers

Parent Involvement:

Parents of students in the program serve on the parent auxiliary committee. This committee arranges for speakers, chaperons, field trips, and other program related activities. They are also involved in sharing students' background information with tutors, and making suggestions for improving the quality of the program. Parents, tutors, and students form an important triangle for mutual understanding.

Results:

A survey conducted in 1975-76, revealed the following:

- —student attendance at Saturday morning tutoring sessions averaged 97 percent
- —a significant improvement in self-image as reflected in a decrease in office referrals
- —ninety-six percent of the students completed the two-year program
- —eighty percent of all employers expressed a desire to rehire or recommend students in the program

Contact Person:

Mr. John Hariston
Program Manager
Vocational Information Program, Inc.
2104 E 30th Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-3466

Program Title:	Production Workshop
Location:	Cleveland, Ohio
Duration:	1976-77
Number served:	320 students
Grade range:	Ninth grade potential dropouts
Ethnicity:	Blacks, Whites and Spanish Americans
Area served:	Urban
Source of Funding:	Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund State of Ohio Compensatory Funds
Expenditures:	$1,272 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program:

Prevention of ninth grade youngsters from dropping out of school.

Objectives:

Participants will become familiar with the world of work through experiences in a production workshop setting, integrated with block-scheduled academic instruction, using a modified curriculum and an individualized approach.

Student's attitude toward school will become more positive as evidenced by the following:

—participants' attendance rates during the year will be a minimum of three percent above the average attendance rate for all students in the workshop.

—dropout rates among participants will be lower than the rate for the remainder of ninth graders in the project schools.

—average attendance rates of project participants will be significantly higher during the year than it was the year preceding participation in the project.

Context:

Involves potential 9th grade students likely to drop out of school when they become sixteen years of age.

Program Description:

The program puts the student in a regular school period but eliminates study hall and makes use of two period blocks for the Production Workshop Project. Students are paid fifty to seventy-five cents per hour for their work experiences. Girls and boys are involved in home economics and other shop type skills. Orders are taken from schools in the area for work and deliveries are made after the order has been completed. Woodworking, printing, metal work and some construction and improvement in the environment are areas in which orders for work

are taken.

Production Workshop personnel plan and implement activities to build both self-image and basic skills through field trips, a student advisory committee and speakers from industry and charitable projects.

The personnel include: two teachers; one part-time guidance counselor; and two teacher aides.

Parent Involvement:

The program emphasizes the parental-community involvement. Each project school holds "open house" and extends an invitation to the community. Parents from each school's program make up a project parent advisory committee and lay persons from the community serve on the program review team that evaluates the program.

Results:

Students made average gains in both reading and mathematics of more than one month for each month in the project.

Both boys and girls attained an average increase of one letter grade during the project year.

Seventy-one percent of the students involved in the project indicated that they were learning better during the project year than they had the previous year.

Contact Person:

Mr. James McCraw
Program Manager
Production Workshop
2104 E 30th Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 687-1872

Program Title:	John Hay Technical Vocational Program for Potential Dropout Students
Location:	Cleveland, Ohio
Duration:	1976-77
Grade range:	10th through 12th grade
Ethnicity:	Black
Area served:	Urban
Source of Funding:	Ohio State Department of Education, Special Needs Services—Division of Vocational Education
Expenditures:	$1,823 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program:	Encourage participants to graduate from high school with a regular diploma.
Objectives:	Provide participants with marketable skills through simulated on-the-job preparation.
	Assist adjustment to school and job life through personal and social counseling.
Context:	Potential dropouts showing the following characteristics: poor attendance, poor achievement, are on public assistance, unacceptable work attitudes, poor self-image and poor adjustment to school.

Program Description:

Courses are offered in four vocational areas: machine shop, drafting, building maintenance and automotive. Shops are scheduled in four period blocks to each class except drafting. This service is provided by special needs. Two academic teachers are assigned to teach English, Mathematics, Science and Reading, as well as related skills necessary for successful vocational shop experiences. Basic communicative skills related to each vocational area are taught. A guidance counselor conducts group and individual counseling in order to provide new information and experience to help students gain greater insight into the availability of job opportunities. He also encourages each student to maintain good attendance and strive for excellence.

Field trips provide opportunities for students to view people working in their particular vocational field. Guest speakers are used to motivate students and reinforce classroom instructions.

Personnel:

The professional personnel include: two mathematics, two science, two English and two reading teachers and one guidance counselor. The paraprofessional staff include: one machine shop aide, one building maintenance aide and one automotive aide.

Results:

In the past two years the Annex has averaged a daily attendance of 78 percent. The dropout rate averaged about ten percent per year. Those who dropped out either entered the armed forces or the world of work. Discipline problems

are at a minimum. Referrals and suspensions averaged approximately twelve per year.

Contact Person:

Mr. William Simms
Program Manager
John Hay Technical Vocational Program
10600 Quincy Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
(216) 229-5310

Program Title:	Extended and Enriched School Year
Location:	East Cleveland, Ohio
Duration:	1976-77
Number Served:	1500 students
Grade Range:	One through six
Ethnicity:	98.75 percent Afro-American
Area Served:	Urban
Source of Funding:	ESEA, Title I Title VII
Expenditure:	$251.44 per pupil

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program: To organize the educational activities individually. To teach children at their individual learning rate and in the style most suited for their needs.

Objectives:
Motivate the child to learn
Assist the pupil with his identification with his school
Change his patterns of learning
Achieve one full year of academic achievement for each year of chronological development

Program Description:

Two major changes in the school process have been developed to attain these objectives. First, six one-week segments of enriching school educational activities were interspersed throughout the year. These activities consisted of five days of instruction conducted by and in local cultural institutions. These included the Cleveland Museum, Resident Camp, Karamu House, and the Cleveland Music School settlement. The instructional programs were ego-involving, required considerable active participation, included experiences ordinarily not capable of duplicating on the school level, and were also designed to be highly educational.

The second change was a revision of the traditional school calendar. The school year was defined as beginning in September and concluding at the end of July. This calendar eliminated the long summer vacation in which many of the learning habits and patterns established during the school year are seriously regressed or lost. The actual amount of school time was not increased. This was effective by including five, one-week vacations interspersed throughout the year. In effect, a pupil's program could be viewed as six similar segments with four weeks of traditional programing, one week enrichment and one week vacation.

Personnel:

The regular classroom teachers of the participating pupils, the instructional staff of the participating cultural institutions, and a coordinating supervisor plan together and implement and evaluate the various enriching experiences.

Parent Involvement:

The Parent Advisory Council of Title I gives input to program development and evaluation, visits for observation/participation to institutions when classes are there, and in follow-up visits with their own children. Parents are encouraged (and frequently respond) to visit both classrooms and institution classes.

Results:

In the cognitive area, participating students average one month's growth in the language skills areas for each month of instruction measured by standardized tests as provided for in the evaluation of the program.

In the affective area, student growth is evaluated by the student's improved self-image, reduction of absence, an awareness of the community beyond the classroom as places of learning, and an improvement in motivation and attitude toward school.

Contact Person:

Mr. John A. Ray
Fiscal Director of Federal and Special Programs
Cleveland, Ohio
(216) 451-1750

Program Title:	Supplementary Education Center
Location:	Cleveland, Ohio
Duration:	1976-77
Number Served:	Monday-Friday—500 students Saturday—1200 students
Grade Range:	Grades Three through Twelve
Ethnicity:	Approximately 90 percent Black Seven percent White Two percent Spanish-American One percent Other
Area Served:	Urban
Source of Funding:	Cleveland Board of Education
Expenditure:	$ 1 million annually

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program:	Help public schools meet the complex demands of the seventies through sound, imaginative programing, supplemented by a variety of educational experiences.
Objectives:	Allow experiences with equipment from the last century and the future to give a sense of time and place; mix the city's children in thoroughly integrated activities; afford classroom teachers views of other techniques and their children in other settings.
Context:	Organized activities daily for children in grades three through six in art, heritage, music, science, drama and communication. Enrichment lessons are offered on Saturday and in the summer for junior and senior high school students.

Program Description:

The Center integrates schoolwork into the world of science, art, music, history, drama and communication. Children from the Cleveland area have access to displays and special lessons in music and art. Exposure to everyday experiences occur at the center which cannot happen in a school setting, such as children operating a computer or viewing a planetarium. Displays of early American heritage, as well as projected future scenes, are available at the center. Teachers can maximize learning experiences for students by integrating the center's activities with classroom lessons, or permit the center's visits to stand on their own merits.

Personnel:

Instructional personnel are primarily non-professional, and largely recruited from the local college population. There are nucleuses of experienced, certified teachers in each department who volunteer their time to the center.

Parent Involvement:

An advisory council was initiated under ESEA Title III for planning purposes during the first three years of the center's existence. Currently,

there is no parent council, but many parents visit and observe the activities at the center.

Results:

Much positive feedback has been received from both children and teachers. Active community support enabled a new building to be constructed in the 1976-77 school year.

Contact Person:

Mr. Donald G. Quick
Director
Supplementary Educational Center
Cleveland Public Schools
1440 Lakeside Avenue, N.E.
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 696-1633

Program Title:	St. Michael's Tribal School
Location:	Devil's Lake, North Dakota
Duration:	1976-77
Number Served:	83 students
Grade range:	Kindergarten through six
Ethnicity:	Indian
Area served:	Rural
Source of Funding:	ESEA Title I
Expenditure:	$736 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program:	Provide remedial education to students in need of such services and mainstream those students into regular classrooms.
Objectives:	Assist students in achieving one year's academic growth through the Title I program.
Context:	St. Michael's is a tribal school operated under a tribal contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Program Description:

St. Michael's operates both a reading program and a special education program with Title I funds, serving approximately one-third of its students. The special education program is unique in its area since it totally mainstreams the special education students into the regular classroom. A new set of terms has been developed for all students—survivor, adaptor and encounterer. The special education coordinator works in each classroom with the students and the regular classroom teacher. Inservice training is provided to insure that all teachers are familiar with the programs utilized. Individualized educational programs are prepared for each student in the Title I program.

Discipline and attendance problems are almost nonexistent. The students have responsibility for their own behavior, and a new point system has been developed to reward students for good behavior. Each student is given ten points at the beginning of each month, with points being taken away for various types of misbehavior. At the end of each month all students retaining any points are allowed to participate in various educational "fun" activities such as games, trips, etc.

Personnel:

Twenty-seven percent of the teaching staff is Indian. Teacher turnover has stabilized at the school. Inservice training is provided to insure that all teachers are familiar with the programs utilized. Five reading teachers and two special education teachers comprise the full-time professionals. There are four full-time reading aide paraprofessionals and one part-time; also, two full-time special education aides and one part-time.

Parent Involvement:

Parents are deeply involved with the activities of the school. St. Michael's does have a Parent Advisory Council which holds public meetings.

Results:

The unexpected increase in students has been readily contended with as a result of the staff working well together, being highly motivated and dedicated. Staff often puts in twelve hour days. This dedication is reflected in the success

of the student population in academic and social matters.

The average academic gain for Title I target students for fiscal year 1976 was: Reading - one year and four months' growth according to the Science Reading Associates testing, and Special Education - one year and one month's growth according to the Wide Reading Achievement testing.

Contact Person:

Mr. George Dunbar
Principal
St. Michael's Tribal School
Devil's Lake, North Dakota 58370
(701) 766-4276

Program Title:	Fort Yates Elementary School
Location:	Fort Yates, North Dakota
Duration:	1976-77
Number served:	310 students
Grade range:	Four through six
Ethnicity:	Indian
Area served:	Rural
Source of Funding:	ESEA, Title I
Expenditure:	$1565 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program:	Provide remedial education in basic skills to students in need of such services within the regular classroom.
Objectives:	Assist students in achieving 1.2 year's growth through the Title I program.
Context:	Fort Yates Elementary is a tribal school operated under a tribal contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Program Description:

Fort Yates Elementary operates a Title I program in the basic skills of reading, language arts and math. Title I serves 40 percent of the students. All target students are provided individualized instruction in the skills through the mechanism of team teaching. The team consists of the regular program teachers, Title I aides and teacher corps personnel. The Title I teachers serve as members of the team to provide alternate specific diagnosis and remediation for target students. A variety of materials are used to meet the needs of the students.

Personnel:

Forty percent of the teaching staff are Indian. There are six regular program teachers, two Title I teachers and six paraprofessionals. There are also four teacher corps interns.

Parent Involvement:

Fort Yates has an active Parent Advisory Council which holds frequent meetings and disseminates information to Title I parents.

Results:

The average academic gain for Title I target students for fiscal year 1976 was Reading/Language Arts .7 year's growth and Math .5 year's growth. Science Research Associates test instruments were used.

Contact Person:

Mr. Walter Hollifield
Title I Coordinator
Fort Yates Elementary School
Fort Yates, North Dakota 58538
(701) 854-7215

Program Title:	Fort Yates Community High School
Location:	Fort Yates, North Dakota
Duration:	1976-77
Number served:	123 students
Grade range:	Seven through nine
Ethnicity:	Indian
Area served:	Rural
Source of Funding:	ESEA Title I
Expenditure:	$943 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program:	Provide remedial education in basic skills for students in need of such services within the regular classroom environment when possible.
Objectives:	Assist students in achieving 1.2 year's growth through the Title I program.
Context:	Fort Yates Community High School is a tribal school operated under a tribal contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Program Description:

Fort Yates Community High School provides Title I services for 40 percent of the students in grades 7-9. To better meet the needs of the students the following modules are in operation:

1. Achievement Level Grouping: All target students are provided individualized instruction in reading, math and language arts through the mechanism of team teaching, small group activity and individual tutors. The team for each classroom, grades 7-9, will consist of the regular program teacher, BIA counselor, Title IV coordinator of diagnostic services, Title I teachers and aides. Title I teachers will provide individual diagnosis/prescription reports on students.

2. Diagnostic/Prescription Component: All target students who are three or more years below grade level and display emotional problems are divided into small groups and receive reading, language arts, math and content reading in a self-contained classroom for a half day. The emphasis will be on individual continuous progress units with behavior modification.

3. Learning Disabilities Component: The target students who are three or more years below grade level and give evidence of a specific learning disability are given individualized instruction designed to compensate for the specific learning disability in a self-contained classroom. They are assisted by the staff hired to compensate these disabilities.

Personnel:

Twenty percent of the teaching staff is Indian. Three regular program teachers and three Title I teachers who teach mathematics, reading and language arts comprise the full-time professionals. Six aides are full-time paraprofessionals.

Parent Involvement:

Fort Yates has an active Parent Advisory Council which holds frequent meetings and disseminates information to Title I parents.

Results:

According to the final evaluation report of fiscal year 1976, the Title I target students made the following gains: Reading/Language Arts - .5 year's gain; Math - .6 year's gain. These gains were achieved through the Science Reading Associates testing.

Contact Person:

Mr. Walter Hollifield
Title I Coordinator
Fort Yates Community High School
Fort Yates, North Dakota 58538
(701) 854-7215

Program Title:	Turtle Mountain Community School
Location:	Belcourt, North Dakota
Duration:	1976-77
Number served:	357 students
Grade range:	Kindergarten through twelfth
Ethnicity:	Indian
Area served:	Rural
Source of Funding:	ESEA, Title I
Expenditure:	$1316 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program:	Give Indian children the basic knowledge necessary to function and be productive citizens.
Objectives:	Show an average academic growth of one year in the basic skills areas. Provide academic training to special education students (survival skills).
Context:	Turtle Mountain Community School is three schools under one roof (elementary, middle, and high school), and is operated cooperatively with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and local school districts.

Program Description:

Several programs funded with federal money include a special education program serving 154 students in grades K - 12 with identified learning disabilities; the Title I Reading Improvement Program serves 300 children in grades 2 - 6; the Language Development Program serves all children in grades K - 12; the Basic Academic Skills Program serves grades K - 8. Approximately 125 high school students are served by the Educational Development Laboratories. The State also provides funding for a Title I Speech Therapy Program.

Personnel:

The full-time staff includes one Coordinator; seven Reading teachers, three Mathematics teachers, seven Special Education Teachers, one Remediation Resources teacher, One Speech teacher and one Vocational Counselor. Part-time staff includes three Reading and seven Special Education teachers.

Parent Involvement:

Parent involvement is a top priority at Turtle Mountain Community School. The school has its own Title I Parent Coordinator, whose function is to aid parent council members in scheduling visits to the school, sponsoring various activities, publishing a newsletter, and coordinating meetings and reports. Parents are also involved as teacher aides in many of the programs.

Results:

Average academic gain has been one year per nine months served. Parents and staff at the school were enthusiastic about the effects of federal funding projects.

Contact Person:

Mr. Roman Marcellais
Title I Coordinator
Turtle Mountain Community School
Belcourt, North Dakota 58316
(701) 477-3239

Program Title:	Wahpeton Indian Boarding School
Location:	Wahpeton, North Dakota
Duration:	1976-77
Number served:	109 students
Grade range:	One through Eight
Ethnicity:	Indian
Area served:	Rural and Urban
Source of Funding:	ESEA, Title I
Expenditure:	$992 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program:	Provide students a total school, a proper home and a complete experience in social living. Strive to assure that students experience steady advancement physically, mentally, socially and morally.
Objectives:	To gain from .6 months to 1.2 years in academic growth for basic skills development.
Context:	Wahpeton is a Boarding school operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs which serves students from twenty-six tribes and seven states.

Program Description:

Title I projects include special education, grades two through five; reading, grades five through seven; mathematics, grades five through seven; basic skills, grades one through four; and supportive services, grades one through seven. Funds are concentrated on those students measuring two or more years behind grade level. The program is correlated and integrated as part of the total school program. Title I teachers coordinate all teaching materials with regular classroom teachers to insure a smooth transition into the regular curriculum.

Personnel:

The full-time professional staff includes three reading teachers, two mathematics teachers, one special education teacher, one remediation resource teacher and one speech correction teacher. The paraprofessionals include two reading aides, two mathematics aides and one special education aide.

Parent Involvement:

Wahpeton has an active Parent Advisory Council that meets five times a year and publishes a newspaper to keep Title I parents informed.

Results:

These individualized programs have proven successful, with some children gaining as much as three years per academic year. All children in the program have gained at least one year per nine months of actual training, with most averaging about two years gain.

Contact Person:

Mr. Leroy Chief
Superintendent
Wahpeton Indian School
Wahpeton, North Dakota 58076
(701) 642-3796

Program Title:	Ojibwa Indian School
Location:	Belcourt, North Dakota
Duration:	1976-77
Number served:	81 students
Grade range:	Fourth through eighth grades
Ethnicity:	Indian
Area served:	Rural
Source of Funding:	ESEA Title I
Expenditure:	$1034 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program:	Prepare elementary students for a successful secondary educational experience.
Objectives:	Show an average academic growth gain of seven months in the basic skills areas.
Context:	Formerly a private school, the Bureau of Indian Affairs now operates the school, which is affiliated with the Turtle Mountain School System.

Program Description:

Language development for kindergarten through grade three provides intensive small group training using the Distar Language Program, overseen by the classroom teacher. Two teachers instruct the class for thirty-five minutes, with the regular classroom teacher assisting in the diagnosis and progress reports made. This teacher also reinforces language development.

Remedial reading activities are held in individual or small group sessions. Four resource teachers work daily with students who are a year or more below grade level. Formula phonics is used with supplementary material selected on an individualized need basis for grades two through eight.

Mathematics instruction is also taught in small group or individualized sessions for grades three through eight. Title I teachers and the classroom teacher work together to achieve a certain level for their students within the regular classroom.

Language Arts are taught to grades four through eight to students exhibiting a weakness in that area. Classroom and Title I teachers formulate a program to compensate students in their weak areas. Intensive individualization in basic skills for those students whose needs are not met in groups or the regular classroom are taught in grades four through eight.

Personnel:

The full-time professional staff includes: four reading teachers, two mathematics teachers, two language arts teachers and seven regular classroom teachers. The full-time paraprofessional staff consists of two reading aides.

Parent Involvement:

Ojibwa school has an active Parent Advisory Council with seven members who meet five times a year. The group publishes a newsletter and other publications to keep parents informed of the activities of the school.

Results:

The basic skills program for the 1975-76 school term showed an average gain of one year and one month.

Contact Person:

Sister Judith Emge
Principal
Ojibwa Indian School
Belcourt, North Dakota 58316
(701) 477-3882

Program Title:	Flandreau Boarding School
Location:	Flandreau, South Dakota
Duration:	1976-77
Number served:	401 students
Grade range:	Nine through Twelve
Ethnicity:	Indian
Area served:	Rural
Source of Funding:	ESEA, Title I
Expenditure:	$615 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program:	Prepare Indian children through academic and vocational training to enter the field of their choice.
Objective:	Show an average academic growth of one year in the basic skills area.
Context:	Flandreau serves thirty-six Indian tribes in nine states. Approximately 401 children are being served, sixty percent of whom have been referred by a social agency.

Program Description:

Individualized learning programs provide student options for academic or vocational training. Auto mechanics, welding, child development, secretarial services, farming, printing and food services are some of the courses offered. Actual on-the-job training is also provided. Reading, mathematics, language arts and dropout prevention classes are also serving the majority of the school's population.

Personnel:

Full-time professional staff includes four remediation resource teachers, one basic skills teacher, one reading teacher, one language arts teacher, three special education teachers and a part-time mathematics teacher. The paraprofessional staff includes five reading teachers, three language arts teachers, five mathematics teachers and three special education teachers.

Parent Involvement:

Flandreau has an active Parent Advisory Council which prints a newsletter informing the parents of activities and occurrences which impact on Title I.

Results:

Academic achievement has tested at better than a year's growth through these programs.

During the 1975-76 school year, the regular program had a 34 percent dropout rate. The Title I dropout center, in contrast, showed a four percent rate.

Contact Person:

Mr. Roger Swenson
Acting Superintendent
Flandreau Boarding School
Flandreau, South Dakota 57028
(605) 997-2451

Program Title:	Eagle Butte Community School
Location:	Eagle Butte, South Dakota
Duration:	1976-77
Number served:	1200 students
Grade range:	Kindergarten through grade twelve
Ethnicity:	White, American Indian
Area served:	Rural
Source of Funding:	ESEA Title I
Expenditure:	$624 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program:	Provide a total educational program for each student at a level that is specific to his or her needs.
Objectives:	Reading participants will gain an average of five percentile points and mathematics participants will gain an average of five percentile points.
Context:	Program is operated under a tribal contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This is the first year the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe has directed operation of the school. Two hundred of the students live in dormitories.

Program Description:

Two certified teachers, two teacher aides and one tutor supply supplementary assistance to identified Title I students with remedial reading materials. The pupil-teacher ratio is kept to a minimum and individualization is stressed. A variety of high interest reading materials is used. Students are encouraged to read at their level for enjoyment.

One certified teacher and three teacher aides supply supplementary assistance to identified Title I students in mathematics. The teacher conducts small group instruction using supplementary materials. Instruction is designed to concentrate on the individual needs of the selected students. The teacher aides work in the mathematics classroom with the identified students using classroom materials.

Personnel:

There are three certified full-time professional teachers, five full-time paraprofessionals, two attendance aides and one part-time reading tutor.

Parent Involvement:

The school has nine parent advisory council members and produces newsletters to keep other parents informed about the school, its programs and activities. The parent council meets approximately five times a year. It consists of five parents of Title I participants and meets with Title I staff, and reviews and approves the Title I application. The parent advisory council also visits the program occasionally.

Results:

The mean amount of academic growth in seven months, using the Metropolitan Achievement Test is:

Grade 6	.4
Grade 7	.8
Grade 8	.8

Contact Person:

Dr. Ervin Garrison
Agency Program Administrator
Eagle Butte Community School
Eagle Butte, South Dakota 57625
(605) 964-8722

Program Title:	Marty Mission School
Location:	Marty, South Dakota
Duration:	1976-77
Number served:	100 students
Grade range:	Kindergarten through grade twelve
Ethnicity:	Indian
Area served:	Rural
Source of Funding:	ESEA Title I
Expenditure:	$980 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program:	Provide Indian children with skills necessary to function well in Indian and non-Indian societies.
Objective:	Students in program will make gains of 1.1 in reading, mathematics and language arts skills.
Context:	The school is operated under contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The school combines boarding facilities with its regular school facilities. Fifty percent of the students are enrolled in regular day programs and fifty percent board at the school.

Program Description:

The student body is drawn from twelve states and fourteen different Indian tribes. The school operates from 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., and provides six week mini courses to build responsibility and increase motivation. There is also a volunteer language program for students interested in learning the Sioux language.

An adult education program serving students between the ages of 16 - 54 is offered in addition to regular schooling. Adult education students are prepared for a General Education Diploma. Roving teachers visit homes to teach evening classes. As the needs of the community expand, so does the program.

Title I funds reading, mathematics and language arts classes for grades five through twelve including diagnostic and need assessment services.

Personnel:

The Professional staff includes four reading/language teachers, two mathematics teachers and one diagnostician. The paraprofessional staff consists of two reading aides.

Parent Involvement:

Marty Indian School has an active Parent Advisory Council with seven members who meet nine times a year and publish a newspaper. Through this publication, Title I parents are kept advised of activities and developments in the program.

Results:

Average expected growth is six percentile points and the mean actual growth is better than a full academic year. Stanford Diagnostic tests are utilized for assessment, as well as teacher observations.

Contact Person:

Sister Christine Hudson
Superintendent
Marty Mission School
Marty, South Dakota 57361
(605) 384-5413

Program Title:	South Elementary School
Location:	Mission, South Dakota
Duration:	1976-77
Number Served:	240 students
Grade Range:	Kindergarten through Grade Six
Ethnicity:	80 percent American Indian 20 percent White
Area Served:	Rural
Source of Funding:	ESEA, Title I Johnson O'Malley Act Indian Education Act, Title IV
Expenditure:	$827 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program:	Provide comprehensive services in reading, mathematics and Follow Through in order that maximum educational gains are made and a positive self image attained.
Objectives:	Strengthen basic skills gains 1.1 years in ten months for students served in grades two through twelve, as measured by the Metropolitan Standardized Achievement Test.
Context:	The South Elementary School is a public school located on the Rosebud Reservation in Todd County. Sixty-six percent of the students attending are from low-income families.

Program Description:

Title I supports programs in reading, mathematics, and supportive services. This is the first year students eligible for Title I services have been kept in their regular reading and mathematics classes and given remedial help during study halls. Approximately 70 children were in these remedial classes, with abilities varying from the first grade up. The Metropolitan Achievement Test is used to measure eligibility for compensatory services. Children must fall below the 49th percentile to receive services.

Approximately 100 children are bussed daily to and from the school, with 140 occupying dormitory space because of the distance between school and home. During the winter months the dormitory population increases because of impassable roads.

Personnel:

The full-time staff includes two teachers, eight teacher-aides, and a speech therapist.

Parent Involvement:

Several Parent Advisory Council members help out with the dormitory students, encouraging their school work and attendance as needed. The Parent Council is kept well informed and plans workshops to explain the operation of the Title I program to the parents.

Results:

Normal curve equivalent gains of 1.6 in reading and 3.2 in mathematics per year were

made. This is considered excellent educational growth.

Contact Person:

Mrs. Elena Marshall
Principal
South Elementary School
Mission, South Dakota 57555
(605) 856-4869

Program Title:	St. Francis Indian School
Location:	St. Francis, South Dakota
Duration:	1976-77
Number Served:	310 students
Grade Range:	Kindergarten through Grade Twelve
Ethnic:	Sioux Indian
Area Served:	Rural
Source of Funding:	ESEA, Title I
Expenditure:	$653 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program:

Retain as much of the Indian culture and heritage as possible in the classroom while instructing students in the necessary arts and sciences of the modern world.

Objectives:

Prepare Indian children to compete in the business and academic world by teaching them to have pride in themselves and their abilities.

Strengthen areas needing reinforcement such as reading, language and computational skills, proposing a nine month gain during the school year.

Context:

St. Francis is located in the south central part of the state. Children are bussed from various sections of the Rosebud Reservation. Formerly a private school, St. Francis has operated under a contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs since 1972. The Sicangu Oyate Ho, an Indian corporation, holds the contract for school operation.

Program Description:

Special education classes serve children in Kindergarten through Grade Eight. Remedial reading programs are taught to approximately 74 percent of the students in grades four through eight. Mathematics reinforcement is taught to 50 percent of the students in grades four through twelve. Language arts programs serve 57 percent of the students in grades seven through eleven. The dropout prevention program serves 24 percent of the children in grades seven through twelve. Forty-eight percent of the children in Kindergarten through grade twelve receive supportive services.

Personnel:

The majority of the teachers and aides are Indian. The full-time professional staff consists of five reading/language teachers, four mathematics teachers, three special education teachers, and twenty regular classroom teachers. Five Title I classroom aides serve as full-time paraprofessionals.

Parent Involvement:

The Parent Advisory Council is an active one. The Council has seven members, five of whom also serve as school board members. The Council

is elected and keeps parents informed on the Title I program and its functions.

Results:

Overall progress for all grades in reading (using the Gates-McGintie Test) is .6 per year; language arts proficiency increased an average of twelve months per year; mathematics skills increased .54 per year; and, dropout prevention programs realized advances of 1.03 per year.

Contact Person:

Mr. Leland Bordeaux
Superintendent
St. Francis Indian School
St. Francis, South Dakota 57572
(605) 747-2296

COUNCIL PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATIONALLY RELATED ACTIVITIES

During the 1976-77 activity report year, representatives of the Council and staff participated in the following conferences, advisory panel task forces and meetings:

Date	Type of Activity	Location
April, 1976	National Association of Administrators of State and Federally Assisted Education Programs Conference	San Francisco, California

A national administrators' conference to explore alternatives for improving scholastic growth of educationally deprived children

---

May, 1976	Early Childhood Conference - Day Care and Child Development Council	Reston, Virginia

A national day care conference to assess federal and state programs affecting their organizations and to formulate resolutions for these programs

---

May, 1976	National Migrant Conference	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

A national conference of approximately 650 representatives working in the area of migrant education in the United States

---

May, 1976	Title I Bicentennial Parent Awareness Conference	Washington, D.C.

The parent conference was designed to foster greater awareness by schools, parents and the community on the impact of parental involvement on student achievement

---

May, 1976	New Jersey Title I Parent Conference	Morristown, New Jersey

A state-wide conference of Title I parents meeting to seek ways to enhance their effectiveness in the program

---

May, 1976	New Jersey Association of Federal Program Administrators Conference	Newark, New Jersey

A state-wide conference of federal program administrators meeting to define technical assistance needs

---

September, 1976	National Title I Parents Conference	New Orleans, Louisiana

A nationwide inservice training conference sponsored by the National Coalition of ESEA Title I Parents

---

October, 1976	Regional Title I Neglected and Delinquent Conference	Madison, Wisconsin

Region V Title I Neglected and Delinquent Conference held to discuss the causes and possible solutions to problems of these children

---

Date	Type of Activity	Location
November, 1976	Region V Title I Officials Conference	Chicago, Illinois

Region V Title I officials meeting to exchange technical assistance plans

---

November, 1976	National Association on Education for Young Children Conference	Anaheim, California

A national conference focusing on legislation impacting on the health, education and well being of young children and their families

---

November, 1976	North Carolina Title I Administrators Conference	Raleigh, North Carolina

A state-wide conference of Title I administrators meeting to exchange information on programs

---

December, 1976	New York State Association of Compensatory Education Conference	Monticello, New York

A state-wide conference Title I program administrators meeting to exchange ideas and information on technical assistance.

March, 1976	Development and Implementation of Title I State Evaluation Models Advisory Panel	Palo Alto, California

An ongoing RMC effort for the Office of Education to develop, field test and implement Title I evaluation models

---

April, 1976	Alternative Designs to Contrast with Current Practices in Compensatory Education Advisory Panel	Reston, Virginia

A Stanford Research Institute study prepared for the National Institute of Education which examines alternative structures for ESEA Title I to meet the needs of junior and high school students and to capitalize on the institutional potential of secondary schools

---

October, 1976	Development of Models for Evaluation and Reporting of Non-Instructional Services in Title I Advisory Panel	Bethesda, Maryland

A RMC study of noninstructional services which will attempt to develop evaluation procedures and reporting models for state and local use

---

November, 1976	Study of Title I Programs in State Operated Institutions for Neglected or Delinquent Children Advisory Panel	Santa Monica, California

Systems Development Corporation is the contractor for the Office of Education's study to evaluate nationally the Title I program in state operated institutions for neglected or delinquent children and children in adult correctional institutions

---

	Federal Interagency Committee on Education Advisory Panel	Washington, D.C.

This is an ongoing interagency committee studying means of increasing coordination and effectiveness of educational activities among federal agencies and is a staff assignment

---

COUNCIL MEETINGS FOR REPORT YEAR 1977

The meetings of the Council during the 1977 report year were:

April 29 - May 1, 1976	Full Council Meeting	San Francisco, California
May 21 - 22, 1976	Full Council Meeting	Washington, D.C.
June 11 - 12, 1976	Full Council Meeting	Washington, D.C.
July 22 - 24, 1976	Full Council Meeting	Newark, Delaware
August 27 - 28, 1976	Full Council Meeting	Washington, D.C.
September 10, 1976	Full Council Meeting	Rapid City, South Dakota
October 29, 1976	Legislative Committee Meeting	New York, New York
	Adolescent Committee Meeting	Washington, D.C.
November 19 - 20, 1976	Full Council Meeting	Cleveland, Ohio
December 12 - 13, 1976	Committee of the Whole	Washington, D.C.
January 28 - 29, 1977	Full Council Meeting	Washington, D.C.
March 4 - 5, 1977	Full Council Meeting	Los Angeles, California
March 18, 1977	Editing Committee Meeting	Washington, D.C.

PROGRESS REPORT ON COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

Introduction

Congressional action relating to the reauthorization of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act will follow the scheduled 1977 hearings. During this hearing period information relating to the effectiveness of Title I will be reviewed. The original premises upon which Title I was founded will be examined. Early assumptions about its strengths and weaknesses will be analyzed.

The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children (NACEDC) was established by Congressional Statute (P.L. 89-10 as amended) to:

> ". . . review and evaluate the administration and operation of this title, including its effectiveness in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children. . ." and ". . . make recommendations for the improvement of this title and its administration and operation."

In fulfilling these requirements, the NACEDC has undertaken many activities, including local program site examinations in widely representative areas throughout the country and reviews of various studies, reports and statements concerning Title I achievement. This report is being released during congressional consideration of the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and attempts to reflect the progress of Title I in determining the future of this federal effort.

Assessment of ESEA Title I

From the inception of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965 the purposes of Title I have been specified in broad terms. These objectives resulted in the use of Title I resources to meet multiple and diverse compensatory educational needs of each state agency and local school district. Title I was not designed for uniform application or administration.

Millions of dollars have been appropriated for national evaluations of the Program's effectiveness. The outcomes of these evaluations have not produced the specific data from which Congress can effectively judge the overall success or failure of Title I.

Compensatory education efforts of local school districts have been expected to encompass a wide spectrum of program objectives and modes of implementation. The services provided reflect the particular individual needs of target students as assessed by the local educational agencies. The target population needs emphasis on the basic skills of reading, mathematics and language arts. Diversified approaches in the improvement of these skills are necessary. However, an excessive variety of programs would dilute the impact of these extra resources. Furthermore, such a wide spectrum of services also diminishes the ability of national assessment groups using standardized criteria to measure accurately Title I effectiveness.

The NACEDC emphasizes that the planning and evaluation of Title I is best accomplished at the local level. The federal role should be to provide a variety of compatible and standardized instruments suitable for measuring effectiveness. It should also compile and analyze local evaluations. The validity of local findings should be reinforced by these federal involvement. There is a general consensus *against* excessive federal involvement and *for* local control. The federal enterprise is also well suited to provide technical assistance to local educational agencies as they perform the complex task of evaluations. Data required by the Federal Government is expensive; therefore, the costs should be covered by federal funding with a specific percentage ceiling. The NACEDC has considered the information in many instances to be insufficient for final judgment of program effectiveness. Congress should exercise caution in interpreting evaluation results which may at times be contradictory or confusing. It would also recommend that any subsequent evaluation efforts at the federal level attempt to present more decisive information.

The NACEDC recommends that in order to receive useful information, congressional authorizations for evaluations and studies of the effects of compensatory education state specific objectives and realistic time-tables for the project authorized.

The Council maintains that the criteria for measurement must not be subject to other variables present in our nation's school systems.

58

Other factors to consider are school closings due to strikes, fuel shortages, insufficient funds which influence educational attainment rates, reductions in local services such as libraries, summer sessions, classroom aides and counselors. Reforms in school finance procedures can cause targeting of funds to vary from those established in 1965 when Title I was first proposed. There is an increasing number of states which appropriate federal funds as state funds (upheld in the Barrera Case and in several other state cases).

The Council developed and utilized five criteria for measuring Title I effectiveness. These criteria should be assessed before entrance into a Title I program and upon completion of the program services.

1. *Reading Scores*—a comparison of program entry levels and exit levels.

2. *Mathematics Scores*—a comparison of program entry levels and exit levels.

3. *School Attendance*—a comparison of a child's attendance rate.

4. *Number of Reported Discipline Problems*—a comparison of a child's incidence of disciplinary problems.

5. *Parent Attendance at School Meetings and Affairs*—the rate of parent participation.

The assessment should be measured not only by suitable tests but other means such as teacher reports and school records.

The Council considers these five criteria as the minimal norms necessary for evaluation of Title I program effectiveness and urges their adoption by the Congress.

The NACEDC has been concerned over the amount of time that Title I children must spend being tested to measure their achievement in the program. On an average, children take at least three standardized tests a year as part of the normal curriculum.[1] Title I children are tested at least two more times and are also subjected to additional local and state tests. The NACEDC has witnessed instances where Title I children have spent up to two months of instructional time being tested. The Council realizes that the use of such tests is an attempt to provide systematic data on the outcomes of instruction and, as a byproduct, affords the opportunity to develop test-taking skills. However, it views instructional time as very vital for the disadvantaged student who is already behind in achievement. These students should not be sacrificed for the sake of producing data.

The NACEDC recommends that school officials be encouraged to minimize testing and maximize instructional time during a given school year.

Effectiveness of Title I Services

Instructional techniques and administrative practices developed for compensatory education have significantly improved the overall quality of instruction in our nation's schools. Extensive experiments with individualized and small group instruction, peer group tutoring, systematic review and reinforcement, and many other learning strategies have increased the understanding and use of effective methods of instruction for specific learning needs of children. The setting in which the Title I instruction takes place, either in the normal classroom of the child or a selected alternative location, has given school administrators additional flexibility in educational program design. The NACEDC also views teacher training, a beneficial byproduct of compensatory education, as an essential part of educational service improvement.

The results of this increased knowledge are observable in many locations and through many methods of measurement. The Wahpeton Indian School in North Dakota, visited by the NACEDC in September of 1976, focused its attention on the basic skills of reading, mathematics, and language arts.[2] The program test results indicate basic skill gains of up to three years per academic year. While the nationally expected gain for successful Title I programs in nine months per academic year, the average gain for this program with its basic skill emphasis was two years per academic year.

The NACEDC's interest in the basic skills area has been buoyed recently by the results of several indicators of achievement gains. Various studies conducted nationwide indicate that Title I has shown strength in improving basic skills, particularly in reading.

A study conducted jointly by the Educational Testing Service and the RMC Corporation points

out that Title I is halting the decline in reading achievement levels of educationally disadvantaged children.[3] The study involved 55,000 students and 3,000 teachers in 226 schools from 1971-1974. Data indicated that Title I children not only improved their reading skills at a faster rate than students without special help but felt better about themselves as readers and toward their reading activities than do their unassisted schoolmates. It also indicated that students served in Title I schools were in greater need (had lower test scores) than were students in non-Title I schools. Thus, Title I is reaching some of the intended children.

The Educational Policy Institute analyzed patterns of reading achievement among Title I children as reported by state educational agency evaluation reports, which indicated average gains of one year and one month per school year.[4] Out of 300 state evaluation agency reports, data was calculated from 283; this represented over three million students across all twelve grades. The reports covered school years 1970-71 through 1973-74. The gains have been stable and appear to hold within states and across the school years covered.

Information submitted to the Office of Education in the annual State Title I reports for 1974 and 1975 continues this pattern of increased achievement in basic skills.[5] Approximately 56 percent of the states report month-per-month gains in reading and/or mathematics for over half the student population served. Fifteen of the states reported average gains of more than a month per month in reading and mathematics skills.

The General Accounting Office's study of reading achievement among Title I students parallels the above findings.[6] The report indicated that 40 percent of the children studied were making a year or more of progress in reading for a year in school.

While Title I only represents three to four percent of the total national expenditures for elementary and secondary education, the above information indicates that this small percentage is making a significant difference in raising the basic skills achievement levels of educationally disadvantaged children.

Program effectiveness is enhanced by:

—time spent in instructional activity
—specific program goals
—meaningful parent involvement
—teacher expectation of success
—student-parent-teacher partnership to achieve objectives.

Further, the NACEDC is questioning practices which may lead to problems with a compensatory education program:

—time spent in pullout programs
—funds diverted to support activities from instructional activities
—misunderstandings regarding implementation of comparability.

Administration and Management of Title I

There are approximately 14,000 local school districts in the United States which receive funds from Title I. These funds are filtered through a complicated set of regulations, procedures and guidelines involving the federal, state and local government.

The Federal Role:

The General Provisions for Program Regulations state that:

> "the U.S. Office of Education should make site visits as often as possible to:
>
> - review program accomplishments and management control systems
> - and provide technical assistance as necessary."[7]

The U.S. Office of Education has conducted program reviews in each of the fifty States, the outlying areas, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs from 1971-1975.

The number of states receiving high ratings from the review teams has increased annually, demonstrating the improved management competence at state and local educational agencies.

The NACEDC views the increased management ratings as reflective of the improved understanding and ability of program administrators of Title I. Attempts have been made to refine and narrow the programs' focus. This has resulted in the concentration of resources on improvement of cognitive or basic skills in reading, mathematics and language arts develop-

ment.[8] Since 1972, the NACEDC has recommended that:

> "the primary objective of Title I programs be to raise the disadvantaged child's level of cognitive achievement."[9]

Although federal administration has substantially improved the effectiveness of program management and goal setting, specific areas still need improvement. Title I regulations must flow quickly to state and local educational agencies for consistent program compliance. The modifications of these regulations specified in P.L. 93-380 became effective in August 1974. The U.S. Office of Education, however, did not publish official regulations until September 1976—over a two year delay. Administrators were forced to implement Title I legislation without current guidelines. Any delay in the publication of guidelines reduces proportionately the ability of administrators to implement the objectives of legislation and to comply with federal requirements.

The NACEDC recommends that Congress amend Title 20, United States Code 1232(g) to require the Commissioner of Education to publish rules, regulations and guidelines of any new legislation affecting educationally disadvantaged children within 120 days after enactment, rather than the 240 days presently stated.

The U.S. Office of Education has the major responsibility for providing technical assistance to Title I administrators. In the past, technical assistance activities have included regional and national conferences, workshops, materials development, identification of exemplary projects, and assistance to national studies of evaluations. *The NACEDC considers technical assistance activities as crucial to the ongoing improvement in Title I programs.*

Technical assistance activities have been severely curtailed by budget limitations. From July 1 through December 31, 1975, the U.S. Office of Education made fifty-six technical assistance visits. From January 1 through June 30, 1976, the number of these visits was reduced to twenty-six as a result of budget cutbacks. Projections for FY 1977 indicate that technical assistance visits will be even more severely cut.[10]

The NACEDC recommends that U.S. Office of Education technical assistance funding be restored to a level no less than the FY 1974 activity level to insure its ability to offer specific technical assistance.

State Role:

State educational agencies also play an important role in developing the implementation and administration of these programs. Federal resources and regulations are processed through state educational agencies and often are modified with additional regulations, program objectives and resources. Approximately one third of the states provide funds for compensatory education programs, and many perform administrative activities such as rulemaking, monitoring, enforcement, technical assistance and evaluation of local compensatory education programs.

State officials indicate that past Title I coordination problems with state legislatures or local district administrators have been substantially reduced in recent years. This has become apparent in interviews with state administrators which are an integral part of the Council's site visit procedures. In addition, various conferences of state and local administrators are attended annually by the Council representatives. Administrators are comfortable with the overall state planning for compensatory education and the role of Title I in that plan. A confidence is building among state educational agency personnel that Title I can harmoniously respond to both federal and state purposes and regulations.

Local Role:

It is the local educational agencies' responsibility to assess the needs of children and identify and develop programs for meeting those educational needs. The planning of strategies and the evaluation of their effectiveness is best accomplished at the local level. Observations of these programs indicate significant improvements have been made to increase educational achievement through compensatory education services.

Concentration on basic skills is an essential, though not necessarily exclusive, element of program effectiveness. Programs designed to fulfill a range of instructional and noninstructional needs of children have been reevaluated; educational resources are being coordinated into a total service package in which Title I contributes significantly toward educational gains.

61

Thus, an increasing number of local educational agencies are concentrating on basic skill development.

Title I administration must demonstrate a number of districtwide and target building characteristics to comply with federal and state guidelines. Target school eligibility, student selection, parent involvement, teacher criteria, and systemwide comparability are specific components which must be included in designing a Title I program. While administrative roadblocks have been reduced in many school systems, there are instances where characteristics of the population and/or conflicting federal, state or local regulations still produce problems in the delivery of Title I services. Each program is unique in character, and must constantly draw upon technical assistance resources to coordinate its program efforts.

Finally, the Council has noted that in the delivery of Title I services to eligible children in nonpublic schools cooperation and consultation by local educational agencies with appropriate nonpublic school officials has increased and improved. Such a trend is in accord with the amendments of P.L. 93-380 as a practical development of the spirit of the original law. While recognizing the existence of difficulties in some states because of legal and constitutional issues, the Council would recommend and encourage further improvement in such mutual responsibility for assuring the delivery of effective services to disadvantaged children in nonpublic schools.

FOOTNOTES

[1] "Standardized Achievement Testing: Some Implications For the Lives of Children," Robert Green, Julie Nyquist and Robert Griffore, 1975, p. 7.

[2] Activities of the NACEDC, Attachment A, page

[3] "Large-Scale Evaluation of Compensatory Reading and Reading-Related Efforts in the Elementary Grades," ETS/RMC study for the Office of Education, OPB&E, 1976.

[4] *Patterns in ESEA Title I Reading Achievement*, Educational Policy Research Center, Stanford, March 1976.

[5] Office of Education data, March 1977.

[6] Government Accounting Office Report, December 1976.

[7] Office of Education Data, December 1976.

[8] NIE Interim Report to Congress, December 31, 1976, p. III-13.

[9] NACEDC Annual Reports, 1972-1977.

[10] Office of Education Data, December 1976.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Administrative Costs—
The expenditures normally incurred by an agency in the act of providing the administrative services necessary for program operation.

Basic Skills—
Reading, mathematics and language arts.

By-Pass Provision of ESEA Title I—
A provision in the law which allows the Commissioner of Education to directly fund an agency other than the designated local educational agency for the administration and operation of Title I programs for nonpublic school children.

Comparability—
A legislated provision which describes demonstratable comparable services for Title I and nonTitle I schools.

Compensatory Education—
Services provided to raise the educational attainment of educational disadvantaged children.

Diversified Educational Programs—
Educational programs offering a wide variety of subjects and/or modes of instruction.

Educational Achievement Level—
The level of achievement in terms of comprehension and performance of skills or subject matter; also the number of grades attained in school.

Educationally Disadvantaged Children—
Children whose level of academic achievement is below that normally expected for the particular age or grade.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I—
The federal financial assistance program to local educational agencies for the education of elementary and secondary school children from low income families. Enacted April 11, 1965, P. L. 89-10 as amended.

ESEA Title I Formula—
A mathematical formula for the determination of Title I grants to local educational agencies.

Exemplary Projects—
Projects in the field of education considered to be outstandingly effective in raising achievement levels.

Five Year Mini-Census—
An updated census activity based on representative national data performed by the Bureau of Census at the five year interval between national census dates. (first mini-census to be conducted in 1985)

Individualized Educational Plan—
A comprehensive plan to provide all or most of the services necessary for the educational achievement of the individual child.

Individualized Needs Assessment—
A comprehensive assessment of the educationally related needs of an individual child.

Instructional Techniques—
Activities designed to provide instruction.

Learning Disabilities—
Disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or using language, spoken or written, which may manifest itself in an imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or do mathematical calculations. These disorders include conditions such as perceptual handicaps, brain injury, minimal brain disfunction, dyslexia and developmental aphasia.

Local Educational Agency—
The agency designated by the local government as responsible for educational services within the local area.

Maintenance of Effort—
To continue to provide educationally related services (as measured by per pupil expenditure index) at a rate as high as or higher than those of the previous educational year plus or minus five percent.

Migrant Children—
Children whose families move periodically from one region to another. Usually used in connection with agricultural labor forces and migrant fishermen.

National Evaluations—
Evaluation studies performed on a national basis of the effects and characteristics of programs.

Neglected and Delinquent Children—
Children with redundant histories of parental neglect or with antisocial behavior characteristics.

Noninstructional Services or Support Services—
Services designed to improve children's physical or mental conditions, but are not instructional in nature, i.e. medical, dental, nutritional and psychiatric services.

Nonpublic School Children—
Children enrolled in privately funded secular and parochial educational institutions.

Preventative Services—
Services designed to reduce the likelihood of physical or psychological conditions developing which could retard the learning process.

Reauthorization—
To authorize again; the right to continue. Refers to ESEA Title I authorization.

State Educational Agency—
The agency designated by the state government as responsible for educational services within the state.

Target School—
A school designated as meeting the criteria for the establishment and operation of a ESEA Title I project.

Technical Assistance—
Assistance in technical areas of program administration and operation.

Title I Participating Children—
Children who meet all the requirements and criteria for participation in ESEA Title I programs.

Part II

LEGISLATIVE REPORT

LEGISLATION REPORT

Introduction

During the 95th Congress, Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act will face a most critical reexamination on reauthorization of the law.

The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children (NACEDC) believes it necessary to contribute to that reexamination. It has gained a unique perspective from frequent interchange with students, parents, teachers, administrators, government officials, researchers and others involved in Title I. This report contains an enumeration of principles which should be considered important to any legislation designed to provide educational services to disadvantaged children (hereafter referred to as the child). Those components of Title I which have proven successful should be retained.

Significant past recommendations contained in previous reports (1966-1976) are appended.

Program Objectives and Funds Distribution

The NACEDC recommends that the primary objective of Title I programs be to raise the educationally disadvantaged child's level of achievement in the area of the basic skills (reading, mathematics, and language arts).

The stated objective of Title I should be to raise the child's level of achievement in reading, mathematics and language arts. Noninstructional Title I services which are not designed to raise educational attainment dilute the priority which must be placed on the basic skills. Where Title I programs are specific in purpose and design, they are more effective and can be better assessed. Effectiveness can be improved by a greater specification of the expected outcomes rather than of the procedures to be used.

The NACEDC recommends that there be a limitation on the use of Title I funds for support services.

The determination of the child's educational needs may comprise an identification of instructional and supportive services. Both types of services are important to the overall educational development of the child. There is a higher probability that more supportive services (medical/dental, nutrition, transportation, etc.) are necessary for children of very poor families.[1] Title I funding of support services should be used only temporarily, if needed, to expedite objectives of educational achievement until more appropriate resources can be provided.

The NACEDC recommends that the use of Title I funds for capital construction of facilities be specifically prohibited.

Considerable attention has been given by school officials in many areas to the economical use of facilities to offset declining enrollments and rising maintenance costs. In isolated instances where facility construction, renovation, repair, or improvement is deemed necessary, funds are available from more appropriate local, state or federal resources.[2] These alternative sources of funds should be used by state and local educational administrators.

The NACEDC recommends that federal funds for services to the educationally disadvantaged continue to be distributed to states and local educational agencies on the basis of economic criteria and then utilized within the eligible program locations on the basis of highest educational need.

The members agree with the original underlying dual premises of Title I. First, there is a correlation between educational and economic deprivation. Secondly, high concentrations of low income families prevent local educational agencies from having sufficient resources to provide adequate programs for their educationally disadvantaged children.

Federal Responsibility for Special Children

The NACEDC recommends that the Federal Government exercise a direct responsibility for special groups of children (migrant, nonpublic school, American Indian, neglected and delinquent) where local or State obligation is not acknowledged or existent.

Education in the United States has been fundamentally structured upon a duality of local and state responsibility. In addition, public education has developed management and financing procedures based upon the resident child in attendance.

Problems of responsibility and service to the child often arise when a student is considered a nonresident or is not in attendance at a public school. Thus, after appropriate procedures and

final determination by the Commissioner of Education, federal financing should be modified. The Federal Government should reserve the right to exercise direct or special provisions of educational funding to the agency it determines to be most appropriate and responsible for serving the special group of children.

The *migrant child,* seen as an educational transient, cannot be viewed as the ongoing responsibility of a district or state other than for the time that he or she is present in that area. Such a pupil will move from district to district and state to state in the course of the school year. Often, the current school district of residence or the state is negligent in its responsibilities to provide the adequate educational services necessary for the migrant child. As transients, with no local status as resident constituents little recourse is available for migrants to alleviate such oversights. Migrant children are ones for whom the Federal Government should retain the right of providing direct funding to a responsive local agency for administration of special services. Funds for this purpose should be directly proportional to the number of migrant children to be served and the cost incurred by the local or state educational agency of residence.

The *American Indian child* the beneficiary of a unique cultural heritage has often failed to receive those necessary services which promote full educational development. As the Indians continue to assume greater control of their nonreservation, reservation and boarding schools under P.L. 93-368, the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, it is expected that programs will respond to the cultural, linguistic, social and economic needs of their children. The historical relationships of the tribes and nations to the Federal Government have created a unique responsibility beyond the local and state levels. This has established the necessity of a special and direct interface of Indian educational programs to the Federal Government.

Neglected and delinquent children in institutions are generally deprived of social and educational benefits which are enjoyed by the noninstitutionalized child. State and local educational agencies are responsible for providing educational services to these children. However, additional services may also be needed to overcome past educational disadvantagement.

In fiscal year 1977, state educational agencies were allocated $28,841,151 of Title I funds to serve 71,531 neglected or delinquent children in state correctional institutions.[3] This amount is significant and should be effectively administered. In instances of state or local noncompliance to serve these children a provision for direct funding for educational services should be included in the Title I law. This provision should allow for appropriate withholding of funds when necessary. A final determination should be made by the Commissioner for an appropriate alternative agency to serve neglected, delinquent or children in state institutions.

Some Title I eligible *children enrolled in nonpublic* schools may need to rely on greater assistance from the Federal Government. Differences among the states in their laws, educational practices and community attitudes sometimes affect the provision of services to eligible children enrolled in nonpublic school. Where this obstacle militates against equitable Title I participation, the Federal Government must assume that responsibility. Such action should be taken only when there has been a final determination by the Commissioner that the local or state educational agency with primary responsibility has substantially failed to provide the necessary services.

The bypass provision of the current Title I law is an instrument of response to this variation among states. This is an effective and acceptable federal alternative where such a situation exists. The procedures allow all parties involved ample opportunity to respond before a final determination is made by the Commissioner.

ESEA Title I Funding Formula

The NACEDC recommends that the funding formula be revised to simplify economic criteria and collection of statistical data on poverty children; provide uniform criteria and appropriate allocation procedures for local districts whether organized on a state, county or district basis, and; provide adequate allocations to urban areas with high concentrations of low income families.

The formula is a mechanism for financing the delivery of Title I services to needy children. Its present structure has created debates among urban, rural, regional and intrastate interest groups which have resulted in a concentration

on dollars rather than children. The formula has been a distracting element in the program to serve children who reside in school districts with high concentrations of low income families.

Accurate assessment and application of the most current census data is a necessity for formula allocations. The advent of the five-year mini-census is a step toward this goal. In addition, many school districts which now employ various computer projected estimates of student populations and characteristics for their planning purposes can forecast with reasonable accuracy Title I eligibility data. A nationwide system should be explored by the Office of Education and, if feasible, employed in the funds allocation process.

The current complexity of the formula data base had produced late allocations each year. *The NACEDC recommends that the U.S. Office of Education employ a firm cutoff date by which accurate data must be received for Title I allocations.*

The current procedure which bypasses the state in favor of the county level does not allow equalization within a state. The current formula allocates funds at the county level, with subcounty allocations carried out by state educational agencies with the U.S. Office of Education's approval. The allocation should be shifted to the state level. State educational agencies could then allocate funds on the basis of the most current counts of children needing services by district.

The current formula is not sensitive to the acute needs of rural and territorial areas. This results in allocations disproportionate to the wide range and intensity of services needed.

The formula should reflect regional cost differentials usually not covered in routine mechanisms of formula allotments. Alaska, Hawaii and the territories are examples of this disparity which presently exist. *The NACEDC recommends a differential in allotment for Alaska, Hawaii and the territories to address extreme disparities of costs in providing services comparable to those provided in the contiguous states; such a distinction should reflect the current cost of living differential for federal employees.*

Individualized Needs Assessment

The NACEDC recommends that Title I legislation require an individualized needs assessment.

Multi-faceted Title I programs have been designed to render educationally related services to the child. Many of these services, while appropriate for some portion of the enrolled students, are not suitable or necessary for every eligible child enrolled in a Title I program.

The present law provides encouragement for a written individualized educational plan agreed upon jointly by the local educational agency, a parent or guardian, and when appropriate the child. The intention of such a provision was to encourage the organized planning of proper educational services to each child. It would also serve to help reduce the likelihood of duplication or omission of necessary services. An individualized educational needs assessment should form the basis for the determination of all educational services necessary for the child's development. It should specifically identify the types of Title I services to be delivered. Individualized needs assessment is prerequisite to effective educational planning. Written individualized needs assessment and educational plans should be required.

The NACEDC recognizes the relationship of all of a child's needs to his educational attainment. It does not, however, view Title I as the sole source for providing the range of services which may be necessary. Where the educational needs assessment identifies a need of a noninstructional nature, other resources should be utilized.

Parent Involvement

The NACEDC recommends that any compensatory education legislation contain components which provide for a direct involvement of parents in an advisory role to the overall program serving their children.

The Council has confirmed the importance of the home/school relationship through its discussions with local compensatory education program administrators, teachers, parents and students. It has concluded that the achievement potential and complete educational growth of the child in elementary and secondary schools is enhanced by parental involvement in the educational process.

The child has, in general, less opportunity for meaningful educational experiences than his more affluent fellow students. Knowledgeable

adult supervision, access to educationally stimulating activities and resources and social development activities are examples of meaningful educational experiences often denied the child. The lack of meaningful educational experiences limit a child's readiness for the school curriculum. This could continue to be a limiting factor throughout his life unless there is effective intervention such as that provided by compensatory education programs.

Parental involvement in a child's educational program will help the parent to understand the educational needs and activities necessary to meet those needs. The parent may then serve to increase the effectiveness of the compensatory education programs.

Cultural differences between the child's home and school may create an educational disadvantagement for the child in the classroom. Parental involvement in the child's curriculum increases the teacher's and administrator's understanding of cultural factors which influence educational attainment. It also provides the parent with insight into the important role of the home in enhancing the child's education.

Parental involvement in the overall program effort, in an advisory capacity, is an essential element for educational growth and achievement. Parents immediate understanding of environmental conditions will contribute to the planning of more effective programs. Parental involvement also acts as an extra-institutional force for change and improvement in the educational services provided to children.

Principals and other educational administrators must recognize that parents of disadvantaged children frequently experience a variety of hardships which tend to limit their participation in the education of their children. Planning of parent activities should reflect efforts to overcome limitations of time (especially for single parent families), working schedules, or access to transportation, in providing programs to train and utilize parents and thereby enhance the opportunity for their involvement.

Citizen Participation

The NACEDC recommends that legislation encourage citizen participation at the state and local educational levels to facilitate the planning, monitoring and evaluation of Title I programs.

Many of the objectives of Title I programs can best be accomplished with the assistance of broadly representative citizen participation at the state and local levels. This representation could be drawn from parents of eligible children, private industry, state economic and manpower development agencies, community institutions of higher education, experts in educational programs for disadvantaged children, local public and nonpublic educational agencies, and the general public.

Such groups should be permitted to advise the state educational agency and the state legislature on the development of Title I policy matters including the preparation of long range and annual program plans as well as:

(1) The accountability of state and local Title I programs;
(2) The comparability of services to the children in attendance;
(3) The coordination of Title I program activities with other federal, state and local programs to achieve the maximum educational benefit from the dollars spent;
(4) The adequacy of Title I programs designed to meet the needs of special children for whom local or state responsibility is lacking or unfeasible; and,
(5) The statewide testing program utilized in needs assessment.

Evaluations and Technical Assistance

The NACEDC recommends that funds allocated for national evaluations be reduced.

NACEDC has stated that the mushrooming educational evaluations at the national level are not cost effective.[4] These evaluations do not provide a correlative amount of assistance to the decisionmaking process affecting educational programs for disadvantaged children.

The NACEDC recommends that national evaluation efforts be limited to developing uniform Title I program standards, evaluation instruments and reporting procedures.

State and local educational agencies may then implement evaluations of program effectiveness and provide the Federal Government with the desired information on Title I programs.

The NACEDC recommends that appropriations for Title I technical assistance to the U.S.

Office of Education and the ten Office of Education regional offices be increased.

Increased technical assistance is needed at the level of service to the child. Regional offices currently assist state and local educational agencies in the planning, application, operation and administration of Title I programs. The effectiveness of these activities is severely limited by present manpower and budget allocation limitations. Sufficient budget allocations would permit regional program specialists to guide administrators toward accomplishment of their compensatory education objectives. Such specialists may participate in the preparation of program reports and program reviews to assure state and local attention to the needs of the children to be served.

Title I Audits and Sanctions for Noncompliance

The NACEDC recommends that Health, Education, and Welfare Title I audit policies and procedures be revised to, (1) reduce unnecessary paperwork; (2) resolve audit exceptions in a timely manner; and, (3) confine audit activities to compliance with federal requirements.

The Health, Education, and Welfare Audit Agency could be the most effective vehicle for insuring local compliance. The present policies and procedures utilized by the audit agency severely limit such effectiveness. Extensive revisions are necessary.

Health, Education, and Welfare auditors, who spotcheck state and local educational agencies, often do not fully understand the objectives of local Title I programs. This has been primarily due to limited interaction between audit and program divisions within Health, Education and Welfare. Interagency attention must be given to developing coordination in areas of Title I program operation and related audit practices. The NACEDC has previously identified specific areas in which improved coordination is desirable. These improvements in the system are less costly, more sensitive and more sensible. Among these were:

(1) audit teams be trained in the program they are to review;
(2) that a program officer from the State be included with the Health, Education and Welfare audit team for the complete audit;
(3) that States be required to spend the amount they would otherwise have had to return to the U.S. Treasury on Title I eligible children in the audited district;
(4) that parent advisory councils of local educational agencies being audited by Health, Education and Welfare have the opportunity to attend the audit exit conference and have the same opportunity as officials to provide written and verbal comments on the draft audit report;
(5) that auditors be required to notify state and/or local compensatory education parent advisory councils when they contact the state educational agency relative to a scheduled audit visit; and,
(6) that a bulletin be published at the state level which is disseminated to state and local parent councils periodically summarizing the scope, findings, recommendations, and disposition of all audits and program reviews.

Implementation of such improvements will enhance local program compliance.

Local program administrators have voiced their dissatisfaction with excessive data collection and reporting requirements. The paperwork compiled is of no practical use in the effective operation of the local program. It is produced simply to facilitate audit reviews. Clarification of the minimum data necessary for federal audits can ease this burden and still produce the documentation necessary for compliance.

Upon completion of the audit, any exceptions identified by the Health, Education and Welfare auditors should be resolved in a timely manner. Lengthy hearing procedures and failure to negotiate recoverable reimbursements have resulted in several millions of dollars in unrecovered federal funds. Local administrators are also frustrated in their desire to understand the findings leading to the exception and recommended modifications in their procedures.

The majority of audit exceptions involve instances of commingling or supplanting of federal funds. Local educational agencies utilize such practices when attempting to integrate Title I activities within the framework of the regular school program. To reduce the likelihood of audit exceptions administrators often institute pullout programs for Title I services. This

procedure physically separates the Title I students, teachers and resources.

Existing audit practices are the primary motivation for this determination. Improved auditing techniques and data records could alleviate this administrative practice. The determining factor of Title I pullout procedures or instruction in the regular classroom should be the "highest likelihood of service effectiveness."

Title I programs must respond to state and local regulations in addition to those imposed at the federal level. In many instances federal audit personnel are only knowledgeable of federal regulations, and may view administrative practices responding to state and local educational requirements as improper. Federal audit personnel must become familiar with all guidelines which impact upon the local education agency programs. An isolation of federal regulatory and administrative concerns must be achieved which does not subjugate state and local administrative rights and practices. Federal audit practices should only identify and reflect local program responses to federal requirements.

State Administrative Costs

The NACEDC recommends that the minimum floor be raised to $250,000 for administrative costs for meeting the federal requirements in the management of Title I at the state level.

Participation in federal programs should not require a disproportionate amount of state funds being applied to administrative costs of the federal programs. The Council has reconsidered the administrative costs provision of Title I, and notes that the floor figure of $150,000 has not been changed since 1966, and needs to be adjusted to reflect cost-of-living increases of the 1970's.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Evaluating Compensatory Education, An Interim Report on the NIE Compensatory Education Study, December 30, 1976. Chapter III, pp. 18-23.

[2] Laws providing Federal financial assistance to local and/or State educational agencies for construction of educational facilities.

a. The Library Services and Construction Act (P.L. 93-380);

b. The Vocational Education and NIE Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482);

c. Emergency School Aid Act (P.L. 92-318);

d. School Construction in Areas affected by Federal Activities (P.L. 815);

e. Economic Development Act of 1976 (P.L. 94-487); and,

f. Local Public Works Capitol Development and Investment Program of 1976 (P.L. 94-369).

[3] Statistics summarized from Office of Education Title I Allocation Report.

[4] "Can We Afford Deficient Evaluations?" An Interim Report by NACEDC, January 23, 1976.

SUMMARY OF PAST COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS

(1966-1976)

Parental Involvement

NACEDC has supported meaningful parental involvement relating to educational services for eligible children in the past by recommending that parent advisory councils be mandated at the local educational level with representatives on a district-wide level; that these parent advisory councils receive appropriate provisions and guarantees of technical assistance and access to public information; that parent advisory councils be involved in the planning, development, operation and evaluation of compensatory education programs; that local initiative be maintained so that programs are developed to meet the specific needs of educationally deprived children; and inservice training of parent advisory council members be mandated and provided for by special incentive grants through states.

Federal Responsibility for Special Children

The Council has consistently supported federal responsibility for special children by recommending that the Office of Education accumulate data on migrant children and utilize that data for effective delivery of services; that a comprehensive migrant program be mandated and that the Uniform Student Record Transfer System (UMSRTS) be used in determining the number of children served for funding purposes and that a bilingual educational component be included in the migrant program.

NACEDC recommended that compensatory education legislation contain mandates for nonpublic school children's participation and that nonpublic school administrators be involved in the total planning process for compensatory education projects and also recommended that a bypass mechanism be provided when there is a failure to provide nonpublic school children with effective participation on an equitable basis in Title I programs.

The Council has recommended that federally funded programs for neglected and delinquent children be reviewed and consolidated; that similar studies be consolidated at the Department of Justice; that public programs be set up to train early childhood center personnel to identify and refer abused and neglected children to authorities; that program eligibility requirements be clarified so that institutionalized children's needs will be met from year to year and that an educational component be included in the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974.

Clarification of Objectives

The Council has recommended against general aid of federal funds to schools, compensatory education is a proven need and should hold federal priority; Council has endorsed concentrating funds where the need is greatest so limited dollars have a genuine impact rather than being dissipated in laudable, but inconclusive efforts. Council has not recommended set objectives for Title I other than raising the educational level of educationally disadvantaged children.

Title I Funds and Construction

The Council has recommended against general aid of federal funds to schools, but has not recommended specifically that Title I funds not be spent on construction of schools for Title I programs.

Comparability

The Council has supported the concept of comparability as a viable requirement for federal education programming accountability and should be retained. Comparability reviews should reflect comparable inputs of services to children, not merely count the numbers of teachers and textbooks; and should be expanded to include the concept that the child's special education needs are being met by State and local funds.

Effective Use of Funds: Evaluations

The Council has devoted an Interim Report to the subject of evaluations because it is an essential element of the effective and sustained

upgrading of program performance. It has pointed out that the practice of evaluations, requires great care and the government can learn some valuable operational lessons for this and other occasions: the need to plan well allowing ample time to carry out the plan well; the need to coordinate, the need to derive maximum value from existing sources and records, the need to insist on representativeness, the need to structure the evaluation so that it really measures lasting impact, the need to imaginatively consider alternatives, and the need to truly welcome and involve public participation.

Distribution of Funds

Council's past recommendations are in keeping with the present recommendations. Council has recommended that Title I ensure that those children who are most economically deprived be served first, and that funds be concentrated where the need is greatest. However, no specific recommendation has been made to deny Title I funding for construction or noninstructional services before.

Funding Formula

The past recommendations of the Council were concerned with facilitating the effective delivery of service to educationally disadvantaged children. Previous recommendations include: the use of AFDC statistics in the Title I formula which would indicate those children from families in excess of the Orshansky index; and the provision that all deprived children from families with incomes the same or lower than the Orshansky index be eligible; also in-kind benefits received by those families in poverty be counted as income for the pruposes of eligibility for poverty-based federal programs. The Council has supported plans to update the present way of counting Title I children and proposals for change for the most equitable formula possible. It has also stated that a single standard of poverty based upon poverty statistics for use in federal funding would simplify matters.

Sanctions for Noncompliance

The Council has recommended sanctions for noncompliance in the past by requiring states to spend from their own funds an amount equivalent to the audit exception on Title I eligible children according to Title I regulations in the local educational agencies where the questionable expenditures occurred.

State Advisory Councils

Council has recommended the formation of State Advisory Councils to work closely in the preparation of the State Plan (or Application, whichever results). Council has also recommended that state advisory councils include elected members of mandated parent advisory councils for Title I who are representative of parents of children from low-income families.

Individualized Needs Assessment

NACEDC has recommended that the local role should be that of program design and individual needs assessment of the disadvantaged child in partnership with the parents. Council also has recommended that legislation and guidelines emphasize alternative educational models which maximize individualization of instruction and wherein performance, related to expenditures, will be considered the basis for determining program effectiveness; and Council has considered individualized needs assessment which determine the development of programs to meet the specific identified needs of educationally deprived children to be a key provision in the Title I program.

Part III

ADOLESCENT EDUCATION REPORT

ADOLESCENT EDUCATION REPORT

Introduction

Local and national objectives to establish educational opportunities readily available and responsive to the individual child's needs have placed a monumental task upon local, state and national legislators and administrators. Billions of dollars are appropriated annually at every level of Government for educational services and for assessment of the effectiveness of those services. However, many children are still failing to reach basic levels of academic achievement.

ESEA Title I programs, the federal vehicle for providing compensatory educational services to underachieving children, have been concentrated primarily on children from kindergarten through the sixth grade. The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children (NACEDC) noted previously the appropriateness of this concentration and further commented upon the desirability of providing preventative services during the early years of a child's life in order to reduce the likelihood of underachievement during the elementary school years. During this developmental period complications such as learning disabilities, malnutrition, and negative attitudes toward schooling can be recognized and addressed.[1]

The NACEDC reaffirms its commitment to the continued concentration of Title I services on the early years. At the same time, it recognizes that a large percentage of educationally disadvantaged youth are not being reached, or were earlier bypassed.[2] School systems are continuing to graduate students who are inadequately educated. This report has been prepared to emphasize current concerns, contributing factors, and desirable modifications in the educational services now provided to disadvantaged adolescents.

Significant improvements in how the nation's middle and secondary schools address the needs of disadvantaged students will not come quickly or easily. School administrators are under considerable criticism for the inadequate and ineffective programs presently available to prepare students for higher education and/or work roles upon graduation from high school. Teachers are faced with crowded classrooms, heavy workloads, and disruptive students. Students are sometimes alienated by the traditional approaches to instruction and are frustrated in attempts to participate in curricula development. Parents and citizens are expecting more from their taxes.

The NACEDC has previously discussed the serious problems and crucial needs of our educational institutions. The NACEDC has also recognized that schools must attempt to provide a personalized set of learning experiences for the individual child as well as instruction for a body of students of varying backgrounds and potentials.

Changing lifestyles, manpower demands, and high unemployment among today's youth are realities that must be addressed. In addition, there is a growing emphasis on the role of educational institutions as focal points for providing social services to the nation's youth. The nation's schools should concentrate on providing for the development of the basic skills necessary for successful participation in this increasingly specialized, skill-oriented society. Therefore, the *NACEDC recommends that Title I funds originally designated for educational objectives not be utilized for the delivery of social services through educational channels.* If the provision of social services is to become the task of educational institutions, funds must be obtained from state and federal sources other than Title I.

Major Concerns

> "Diversity is the only possible answer to the fact of individual differences in ability and aspiration. And, the means of achieving 'quality' within a framework of 'quantity'."[3]

Unemployment among out-of-school teenagers is at a record level and increasing annually. The secondary schools are overdue in providing diversified educational programs to meet the requirements of today's adolescent population. This conclusion is supported by the following:

> . . .one in four youth does not complete the planned, formal program of secondary education;[4]

> . . .large numbers of the students leaving school, whether by graduation, withdrawal, or expulsion, are seriously deficient in the skills essential for minimal

competence in communication, computation, and job entry;

. . .vandalism, assault, violence, and drug abuse constitute what is almost a way of life in many schools and occur frequently enough to disrupt the educational process;[5]

. . .today's youth are limited in their exposure to work experience which could provide earnings along with learning opportunities.

Section 148(b) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 states, in part, that:

> "The National Advisory Council shall review and evaluate the administration and operation of this Title, including its effectiveness in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children, including the effectiveness of programs to meet their occupational and career needs. . ."[6]

The intent of the legislation seems clear that Title I is designed to increase the academic base of the involved student. This is necessary to enhance the adolescent's interest and competency necessary for successful and productive work roles. These aspects of effective educational programs form the body of this report.

Characteristics of Effective Programs

In order to assess the effectiveness of any service program—educational or social—the objectives of the program must first be defined and standards of achievement decided upon. The outcomes must include standards of success or failure, if an evaluation is to be made of quality, adequacy and appropriateness. This process is further complicated by the necessity for measuring services impacting upon achievement. In isolating common characteristics which have demonstrated desirable results, it was kept in mind that standards for judging effectiveness are related to the student. Each youth must be provided the right and opportunity to develop his maximum talents and capabilities.

In conducting seminars and site visits to particular adolescent educational facilities, variations in service needs and desirable achievement goals were evident. Alternative programs of instruction have been developed to provide options to students poorly served by traditional methods. In spite of the variations most of the programs assessed had all or some of the following common characteristics.

The NACEDC recommends that educational programs serving disadvantaged adolescents include institutional techniques utilizing some of the following characteristics:

- *individualized education plans;*
- *work experience programs;*
- *expanded vocational education programs;*
- *alternative programs for potential dropouts;*
- *guidance and career counselors with specific roles;*
- *peer tutoring;* and,
- *meaningful parent involvement.*

Even though the individual school districts utilized different approaches, positive results in the area of basic skills as measured by achievement test data were observed. Students displayed a more positive attitude toward learning and took pride in their accomplishments. The NACEDC observed firsthand effective programs in operation in California, Delaware, Ohio and North and South Dakota. Classroom observations and interviews included school officials, teachers. students, and parents. Such visits provided an opportunity to observe specific strengths and weaknesses which cannot be assessed by tests.

Individual Educational Plans

The NACEDC recommends that federal legislation require state plans which incorporate an individual educational plan.

The wide variety of traditional and alternative curricula components available for today's youth necessitates early planning of educational goals. It is not enough for educators to simply "make available" appropriate educational services. Children entering high school must be made aware of the services available, and both the child and his parent(s) must receive counseling as to educational programs "most effective" for the child.

The Council suggests that informal discussions which include each high school student, parents, teachers and counselors become a fundamental characteristic of educational program placement procedures. Additionally, the progress of the student in the subjects initially determined and

the evaluation of the appropriateness of those services should be a subject of continual home and school discussion.

In developing each individualized educational plan, the Council suggests the plan should proceed from an identification of educational opportunities to: (a) maximize individual skills and talents; (b) achieve an acceptable level of competency for future goals; and, (c) participate fully in the social and cultural benefits of the community.

Work Experience Programs

The NACEDC recommends that federal legislation require state plans to incorporate work experience opportunities for adolescent youth.

Many educators believe that the aim of education should be to develop social competence along with basic skills in order to allow high school graduates to participate as productive adults in our society. Since such participation includes some form of economic livelihood, schools should provide opportunities for the development of those abilities which will insure our youth of being able to compete in the world of work.

The lack of development of this area has contributed to the high rates of dropout and unemployment among youth. These rates are reaching peaks during a time of eeonomic crisis and record unemployment. Employment opportunities for high school dropouts are further limited by the increasing pool of unemployed high school and college graduates. Projections by the U.S. Department of Labor indicate tat by 1985 one out of every five workers in the nation will have completed four years of college or more.[7]

Furthermore, the growth of technology and the service industry and the needs of the job market have expanded significantly the demand for noncollegiate programs of post-secondary education.

The NACEDC learned during site visits that many students became disruptive or achieve on a lower level when not motivated. Many such students were, however, capable of learning best when they received an opportunity to participate in work experience or other types of programs which met their interests. Motivation, as well as positive attitudes toward higher levels of achievement, is frequently restored through work experience programs.

The NACEDC recommends that school curricula and instructional techniques be made flexible and realistic for youth in junior and senior high schools.

The assumption that more schooling always leads to better jobs at higher levels of pay is questionable. Youth realize this change in economic reality. They are becoming increasingly "now" oriented with respect to education and work relationships.

School districts around the nation are beginning to reform and expand vocational education and the results are impressive. The Supplementary Center in Torrance, California, is an example. Although this occupational training center receives no federal funds, it has been serving as an extension of the vocational training programs in six school districts. Concentration of learning resources provides enrollees with competency in academic skills as well as in job entry skills. The center represents a new approach to total education. Similar programs demonstrating positive results in regaining personal self-confidence and skill development were also observed in Parma, Ohio and Wilmington, Delaware.[8] *The NACEDC recommends that state educational agencies be encouraged to investigate all possibilities of establishing work experience programs for disadvantaged youth.*

Expanded Vocational Educational Programs

The NACEDC recommends that priority be given to expansion of quality vocational education programs.

The Council has observed that disadvantaged adolescents can benefit from vocational training in their high schools. Approaching learning and techniques of instruction through vocational education has been more effective for these youth than the traditional classroom and academic settings. In many school districts however the opportunities for vocational training are limited.

Opportunities for vocational training are often limited to students age sixteen years or older. By the time many youth reach this age, particularly among the disadvantaged, the child has already become frustrated by academic failure and dropped out of school. Without

either academic or vocational skills, the dropout has no marketable abilities with which to secure employment.

In various school districts, vocational training has direct effect on student morale as well as on future skill competency.[9] Giving youth this type of education instills a sense of learning and accomplishment. For many students this restores a sense of worth and creates the attitudes necessary to sustain the learning process.

Alternative Programs/Schools

The NACEDC recommends that youth be given the opportunity to acquire skills and knowledge in a variety of program settings.

Alternative programs/schools are another vehicle to facilitate reform in the traditional school settings. These programs are effectively closing the gap between education and work, restoring a positive self-image to youth, and creating the type of learning environment necessary for student achievement.

Alternative programs/schools are designed to respond to the unique talents and interests of youth which cannot be adequately addressed within a singular instructional setting. Such alternatives provide students with instruction in basic skills in addition to on-the-job training or practical experiences in skilled trades. These types of programs can provide experience which are prerequisites in job areas such as the cultural arts, sales, computer sciences, etc.

The lack of options for flexible learning styles, particularly for disadvantaged youth, may result in their failure in school and life. These youths face unemployment or minimal earnings along with the failure to acquire basic necessities in academic areas. Alternative programs/schools attempt to enhance the traditional settings by providing the disadvantaged youth with the opportunity to increase their skills.

These programs are designed to alleviate many of the stated concerns in this report, such as student dropouts, absenteeism and disruptiveness. Such programs also restore the positive attitudes and motivation needed in any learning environment.

Examples of these programs were observed in Delaware, Ohio, North and South Dakota and California.[10] Students who had been identified as potential dropouts and those who had already left the regular school programs prior to graduation had been given that "second chance" to acquire the necessary skills to function in society. This "second chance" was provided both in and out of the traditional school system.

In Delaware, Project 70001, a national nonprofit corporation funded, in part, by the U.S. Department of Labor, is a unique program for unemployed, out-of-school youth. This program operating in 17 locations is successfully providing alternative education and on-th-job training to youth between the ages of 16 and 22. Part-time instruction is directed toward aiding youth to develop basic skills, while on-the-job, in order to obtain a General Education Diploma. (see site visit report, page I-14)

Continuous upgrading of employee entry level skills becomes necessary with the changing nature of commerce and industry. The State of Ohio, Department of Education, encourages the development and implementation of a wide range of educational options for students of all backgrounds. These options reflect jobs currently available as well as those which will be availabie in the near future. Students are provided with alternative programs in addition to regular school programs. This allows many to regain self-confidence. Students characterized by "failure" and those who had once left school are now experiencing patterns of achievement. Additional programs in South Dakota and California were also viewed by the Council.

Guidance Needs of Youth

The availability of adequate counseling services for youth in our schools is inadequate. A concerted effort must be made to provide the students with the decisionmaking tools needed in today's complex world. This task cannot be thrust upon guidance counselors alone. *The NACEDC recommends that guidance services be a totally planned program in each school district. NACEDC further recommends that students, counselors, mental health professionals, teachers, parents, and administrators participate as a team in providing adequate services to youth.*

The roles and responsibilities of this group must be both comprehensive and specific in order to meet the needs and aspirations of today's student body. Guidance services are an essential component in effective programs for disadvantaged youth. The counselor should serve

as a resource person channeling the necessary information to other members of the team rather than attempting to provide all the counseling services alone. Each member of the team needs an understanding of his role and of the type of counseling services necessary for maintenance of the total school program.

According to a survey conducted among high school students, only one in ten graduating high school students met with counselors prior to graduation.[11] This lack of effective guidance especially among the disadvantaged fosters the selection of educational criteria and experiences *unsuitable to the needs, abilities,* or desires of students.

The success of the Supplementary Occupational Center (SCROC) in Torrance, California, can be partially attributed to their emphasis on the team effort approach to guidance. Maintenance of counseling communication networks in the SCROC areas has been an essential element in creating close working relationships between the center, the student, the six school districts, and business and community personnel. (see site visit report, page I-12)

If students are to be assured programs that are in line with his or her achievements, mental attitude levels and interests, the team effort must be encouraged and all groups should be committed to meet and work with the unique needs of students.

The NACEDC recommends that school officials encourage school guidance department to give priority to disseminating realistic information as well as expectations concerning post secondary opportunities to students with special educational needs.

Peer-Group Tutoring

The NACEDC found that overall student interest and motivation is bolstered in programs implementing peer-group techniques. It is particularly effective when used to emphasize further development of basic skills. The High Intensity Tutoring Project in Highland Park, Michigan, utilizes this technique with a high rate of success. Data has shown that the project produces gains with both the students tutored and those selected as tutors in 95 percent of the cases.[12]

The program has been successful not only in improving student motivation, but also in increasing the school's overall interest in a team effort and reducing discipline problems. Students develop more self-esteem and self-worth and the attitudes extend into the total curriculum. Teachers, aides, and administrators expressed enthusiasm about the effects of the program when meeting with the Council. Such a model is also adaptable for use in other school districts throughout the nation.

The NACEDC recommends that more emphasis on peer-group tutoring be encouraged to reinforce basic skills and build self-esteem among educationally disadvantaged youth.

Parent Involvement

The NACEDC recommends that parent involvement be extended to influence the education of the adolescent child.

The NACEDC has gone on record in support of meaningful parent involvement in Title I programs. It continues to consider it a key factor in the success of a child's educational experience. The school and parent share a joint concern for the child's welfare. Working together in a cooperative and supportive partnership, they can help the child in his effort toward educational achievement.

Active parent involvement can reinforce the skills and attitudes learned at school and thereby increase the child's motivation to learn. Communication between parent and school can provide insight into the child's background pointing to needs which may merit special attention. Parents should be consulted on a regular basis for their opinions, suggestions, and perceptions of the child's needs and their ideas on how those needs can be met most effectively. In addition, parents can contribute directly to the educational process. When aides are desired, parents can be trained to fulfill this need. Parents can serve effectively as home-school coordinators, school monitors, and in a variety of other capacities. Their first-hand knowledge of the child's environment is an invaluable tool that can be used to great advantage by school personnel.

To achieve active parent involvement within a school's seeting, the administration must consider the views and suggestions of the parents concerning the total school programs. Parents should become involved in the formation and operation of school policies and procedures in

providing educational services. While not displacing or superseding the role of the school administration, parents can direct effective and desirable attention to areas of curriculum development often overlooked or deemed adequate by the administration. The result is usually to strengthen the school's program.

For example, at Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation, Belcourt, North Dakota, top priority was placed on encouraging parent participation. School officials discussed utilization of parents as a "vital link" between the students and school community. Parents were given roles such as sponsoring activities to involve other parents, scheduling parent visits to the school, assisting in publishing community newsletters, coordinating parent meetings and reports, and serving as aides in the classroom. In some instances, due to geographical distances between school and home, buses were used to bring parents into school along with their children. This service allowed the parents to participate in the child's learning activities.

In school districts in Ohio, school officials were using the "multi-district" approach for training parents. Faced with financial limitations, these activities were designed to "stretch the training dollars" without eroding the educational services provided to the children. Participating school districts planned countywide meetings in order to involve as many parents as possible to participate in training and advisory council activities.

At training sessions such as these, parents are helped to function effectively in their advisory roles. This is beneficial not only to the school but to the parent and student as well.

The NACEDC recommends that local school districts be encouraged to provide parents with the effective assistance necessary to carry out their advisory roles.

Other Council Concerns

High School Diplomas:

The NACEDC recommends that the high school diploma be based on competency and awarded only upon attainment of a recognized level of accomplishment by the student.

While the term "minimal competency" has not achieved national acceptance when applied to graduation requirements, many school systems have expanded graduation criteria to include diplomas which describe accomplishment in terms of basic skills, survival skills, job-entry skills, etc. With alternative courses and programs growing popular among youth, verification of competency must remain within measurable limits. While the Council emphasizes the need for a total educational system which is appropriate and adequate for all youth, the competency-based diploma should be awarded as a meaningful credential of accomplishment suitable for further higher education and/or job entry.

Based on experiences of state and local educational administrators, the Council cautions states to be sensitive to student incentives derived from the expectation of earning such a credential and gaining the benefits of its inferences. A lower overall standard of graduation, while allowing a larger percentage of students to graduate, might destroy student initiative while also limiting the usefulness of the earned credential. While the terminology and thrust will differ with each state, competency-based graduation diplomas must clearly indicate and define minimum standards which assure nationwide acceptance.

The NACEDC recommends that parents and students be included in task forces developed to prescribe minimum standards of accomplishment for high school graduation.

The NACEDC recommends that minimum standards be set sufficiently high not to dilute the value of the high school diploma.

Parenting Skills

In many of the nation's schools, courses in parenting skills are still nonexistent. The NACEDC sees such education as an ongoing process.

Researchers find that 20 percent of our adult population are "functionally illiterate."[13] They are unable to fill out simple forms or make simple deductions essential to function as an adult in day-to-day affairs. "Disadvantaged" children will become a large segment of this population unless we take immediate steps in our educational system to remedy the situation.

In this context, the Council believes the challenge can be met by a gradual sequential approach which can help children understand themselves. This approach should continue from elementary through junior high school levels.

Required courses in home and family life should be made part of the general education curriculum along with the 3 R's at the junior high school level.

The NACEDC recommends that parent education be encouraged in the junior and senior high schools.

The NACEDC recommends that more youth-adult community guidance centers be established as family counseling agents in conjunction with service and planning with ongoing public and private institutions.

Summary and Conclusions

The NACEDC has gained much valuable information through its planned series of seminars and site visits. Observations made of the various components outlined in this report are considered essential in the delivery of effective educational services to the disadvantaged adolescent.

The NACEDC recommends that Congress give more attention to the common characteristics of program effectiveness: individualized education plans; work experience programs; expanded vocational education programs; alternative programs for potential dropouts; guidance and career counselors with specific roles; peer tutoring; and, meaningful parent involvement, and utilize these findings in determining effective programs for adolescents.

The traditional approach in our junior and senior high schools has been inapplicable. Until recently, few alternative models demonstrated characteristics which could be replicated in other school districts. In those communities implementing programs with such characteristics as: individualized education plans, work experience, alternative programs/schools, guidance services, peer tutoring and parent involvement, the result has been a common denominator of success in restoring student interest and providing the skills necessary for a productive future.

Areas of academic focus require new efforts to streamline the curriculum allowing additional time and resources for placing higher priority on characteristics identified in this report.

In summary, despite the complexities of administering effective education programs in intermediate and secondary schools, there are workable options available to local educational agencies. Title I, already includes services to adolescents. The implementation of additional programs aimed at high schools is limited due to current funding levels. Expansion of federal, state and local resources, together with increased awareness by school administrators can make a difference in educating today's adolescent.

FOOTNOTES

[1] NACEDC 1976 Annual Report to the President and Congress, section on *Early Childhood Education.*

[2] For the purpose of this report, the NACEDC defines the term "adolescent," to include the population of youth between the ages of twelve through eighteen.

[3] Dr. William Glasser, *Identity Society,* 1975, p. 110.

[4] U.S. Office of Education, *Estimates of School Enrollment, 1970-1984,* 1976.

[5] Report on hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, U.S. Congress, 1976.

[6] ESEA, Title I, P.L. 89-10, Section 158(b).

[7] U.S. Department of Labor Statistics, 1976.

[8] NACEDC Site Visit Reports, pages I-14—I-21.

[9] NACEDC Site Visit Reports, pages I-14—I-55.

[10] NACEDC Site Visit Reports, pages I-12—I-55.

[11] Survey of High School Graduates, 1972.

[12] NACEDC Annual Report, *Successful Programs,* 1976, p. 55.

[13] Office of Education, Division of Education for the Disadvantaged, Dr. Richard Fairley, Director.

Part IV

STATISTICAL DATA

Name of Study	Expected Cost	Description of the Study	Current Status
Office of Education (OE) (1) Study of Compensatory Reading Programs in Elementary Grades (6/30/75 - 12/31/75)	$3,403,678 obligated funds	OE is providing a nationwide assessment of compensatory reading projects including: 1. overall impact of programs; 2. effectiveness levels of different approaches; and, 3. varying costs of different approaches.	Data collection completed; final report available shortly.
(2) Sustaining Effects of Compensatory Education on Basic Cognitive Skills (7/75 - 7/80)	$13 million	Began its first operational year, 7/1/76. Data collection activities in the longitudinal sample involved 326 schools with 110,000 students in grades 1-6. Student achievement data will be collected during school year 76-77. A survey of 15,000 households will be conducted this Spring (77) to determine the number of eligible Title I children who do or do not receive services.	Data will be collected for three years. Reports will be available each year in January.
(3) Evaluation of Title I Programs for Neglected and Delinquent Children in State Institutions (9/76 - 6/77)	$512,464	This national evaluation of state-operated programs began Fall 76 with site visits to 100 institutions in 40 States to examine characteristics and operations of these programs. Impact of the Title I services on students will be examined in 30-40 of the selected state institutions, beginning Spring 1977. The study will also include suggested evaluation models and reporting procedures.	Final report will be issued after the 1977 - 78 school year. Report on the sample will be available in June, 1977.
(4) Study of Title I Migrant Education Programs (2/76 - 7/77)	$798,652 (from Title I monies)	This national evaluation study will assess the overall impact of the program on student attitudes, personal development, and achievement in reading and math. An evaluation handbook will be developed to aid State and local educational agencies in evaluations and include formats for reporting results. The study will also validate the data in the Migrant Record Transfer System for funding purposes.	In planning stage-Operational phase will begin Summer, 1977, with data report due 1980. Evaluation handbook due Fall, 1977. MSRTS data will be collected mid-1977; final report due February 1979.

CURRENT NATIONAL TITLE I STUDIES AND EVALUATIONS

Name of Study	Expected Cost	Description of the Study	Current Status
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education (ASE) (1) Educational Policy Research Center Studies	$962,000	Stanford Research Institute is examining four policy areas with respect to Title I: (1) Educational gain attributed to Title I participation? (2) Program management problems and trends; (3) Parent Advisory Councils; and, (4) Interaction of Title I and other education programs.	Reports will be available September 30, 1977
(2) Feasibility Study of Estimating Children in Poverty by Local School Districts (4/1/75 - 6/30/77) P.L. 93-380, Sec. 822(b)	*NA	ASE in conjunction with the National Center for Educational Statistics is conducting a study to evaluate the alternative methods for updating estimates of the number of children living in districts and states.	Interim report completed - 3/76; final report due mid-1977.
(3) Survey of Income and Education (1/15/75 - 6/30/77) P.L. 93-380, Sec. 822(a)	*NA	ASE in conjunction with the Bureau of the Census has conducted a sample household survey to assess the number of children aged 5-17 who live with families at or below the poverty level in each State. Other information including income, migration, food stamp recipiency, etc., will be compiled. A report will be made to Congress on the accuracy and utility of this information.	Reports due: 1. Poverty Number--12/31/76 2. Other information 1977 3. Accuracy of data 6/30/77
(4) Development of New Approaches to Determining the Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Children	None--All FICE members volunteer.	FICE subcommittee on Minorities and Disadvantaged populations is examining different approaches to identify educationally disadvantaged children, and their educational needs, along with new Federal strategies for dealing with them.	Analyzing data from Income Survey and other sources.
(5) Study of Poverty Measures of Poverty (9/15/74 - 12/31/75) P.L. 93-380, Sec. 823	*NA	An interagency subcommittee of the ASE Task Force on the Disadvantaged has reexamined the definition of poverty used in the current Title I allocation formula. Included a review of the available information, and an investigation of the effects of alternative measures of poverty as used in the Title I formula.	Submitted: 4/30/76.

*Not Available

Name of Study	Expected Cost	Description of the Study	Current Status
(5) Development and Implementation of Title I State Evaluation Models (6/75 - 6/77)	$701,195	Ongoing effort by OE to develop, field test, and implement evaluation models. Several States and LEAs have volunteered to "field test" models and reporting forms during current school year. OE will also establish regional Technical Assistance Centers to assist States in familiarizing LEAs with the proposed models and reporting forms.	Conducting regular workshops for State personnel to familiarize staff with models and reporting system.
(6) Development of Models for Evaluation and Reporting of Non-Instructional Services in Title I (6/76 - 9/77)	$376,426 (from Title I monies)	The study will attempt to develop evaluation procedures and reporting models for State and local use in the area of non-instructional services. Twenty-five sites will be selected for case studies and field tests of the evaluation models and reporting procedures.	Initial study begun June 1976. Field tests to begin February 1977. Final report due September 1977 with evaluation handbook.
National Institute of Education (1) District Survey I	$1.5 million	Provide descriptive data on 100 school districts nationwide to determine the decisionmaking, planning, evaluation, communication and managerial practices effecting Title I projects in those sites.	Data has been collected and is being analyzed. Results and reports are due by the end of July 1977.
(2) Demonstration Districts on Alternative Allocation Criteria	$5.5 million	Thirteen school districts have been selected to demonstrate the effects of changing the rules for allocating Title I funds within school districts. The districts have changed the eligibility criteria from poverty to achievement and/or changed the number of schools and pupils who participate.	All districts have been selected and will operate as Demonstration Districts through the 1977-78 school year.
(3) A Study of Instructional Dimensions	$1.7 million	Designed to assess whether programs which differ along structured individualized instruction in reading and mathematics also differ systematically in their effects upon students. Four hundred Title I or Title I eligible are involved in grades 1-3 in five States are involved in the sample. (not designed to be nationally representative)	Study will progress throughout 1977-78 school year.

Name of Study	Expected Cost	Description of the Study	Current Status
(4) Survey of Federal and State Title I Regulations	$185,000	The survey was conducted in a geographically representative sample of 10 States. It is analyzing the degree of clarity and consistency in Federal Title I regulations, the differences and similarities between these and State regulations, and problems of implementation at the State and local levels.	A final report is due in the next few months.
(5) Survey of State Administration Practices	$792,000	This survey is to provide a description of the nature and amount of State management activities in the administration of Title I, primarily relating to the interaction between SEAs and LEAs. It also will identify variables which are correlated with State management activity.	Survey data will be collected in Fall, 1976 and case study data will be collected from selected LEAs after January 1977.
(6) Study of the Impact of Parent Involvement Upon Management and Administration of Title I at the Local Level	* NA	Four to six case studies will be conducted to identify different forms of parent involvement in Title I, determine which organizational characteristics of Title I programs are associated with and affected by different types and levels of parent involvement. The study will also identify the community level determinants of parent involvement, and administration which affect the level and nature of parent involvement in the program.	Study will be conducted during 1976-77 school year. The final report is due September 1977.

* Not Available

STATE FUNDS FOR COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

	1974	1975	1976*	1975-76
TOTALS				
1. Alabama	0	0	0	
2. Alaska	0	0	0	
3. Arizona	0	0	0	
4. Arkansas	0	0	0	
5. California	141,250,000	126,750,000	107,600,000	Pre-K, Elem., Sec.
6. Colorado	0	170,000	0	
7. Connecticut	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,200,000	Pre-K, Elem., Sec.
8. Delaware	0	0	0	
9. District of Columbia	0	0	0	
10. Florida	5,916,192	0	0	
11. Georgia	0	0	10,200,000	
12. Hawaii	1,600,000	1,600,000	9,900,000	Pre-K, Elem., Sec.
13. Idaho	0	0	0	
14. Illinois	0	0	0	
15. Indiana	0	0	3,000,000	
16. Iowa	0	0	0	
17. Kansas	0	0	0	
18. Kentucky	0	0	0	
19. Louisiana	0	0	0	
20. Maine	0	0	0	
21. Maryland	10,000,000	9,799,000	9,500,000	Elem., Sec.
22. Massachusetts	0	0	0	
23. Michigan	22,500,000	22,500,000	25,500,000	
24. Minnesota	0	5,000,000	0	
25. Mississippi	0	0	0	
26. Missouri	0	0	0	
27. Montana	0	0	0	
28. Nebraska	0	0	1,600,000	
29. Nevada	0	0	0	
30. New Hampshire	0	0	0	
31. New Jersey	0	0	0	
32. New Mexico	0	0	0	
33. New York	47,000,000	149,500,000	146,000,000	Pre-K, Elem., Sec.
34. North Carolina	0	0	0	
35. North Dakota	0	0	0	
36. Ohio	33,337,400	38,000,000	33,300,000	
37. Oklahoma	0	0	0	
38. Oregon	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	
39. Pennsylvania	0	0	1,000,000	
40. Rhode Island	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	
41. South Carolina	0	0	0	
42. South Dakota	0	0	0	
43. Tennessee	0	0	0	
44. Texas	0	0	25,400,000	
45. Utah	600,000	600,000	0	
46. Vermont	0	0	0	
47. Virginia	0	0	9,300,000	
48. Washington	8,100,000	4,600,000	5,000,000	
49. West Virginia	0	0	0	
50. Wisconsin	8,111,000	3,100,000	0	
51. Wyoming	0	0	0	
52. American Samoa				
53. Guam				
54. Puerto Rico				
55. Trust Territory				
56. Virgin Islands				

*Handicapped monies are separate from Comp Ed monies.
**Figures from Public School Program-Supt. of Documents 1975-76.

1977 FORMULA CHILDREN COUNT FOR LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

	Total	Poor	AFDC	Delinquent	Correctional	Neglected	Foster
TOTALS	8,561,307	7,700,359	589,156	22,274	1,739	47,518	200,261
ALABAMA	275,480	272,146		127		680	2,527
ALASKA	13,915	12,393	871	45		203	403
ARIZONA	86,385	84,014		259		234	1,878
ARKANSAS	156,656	155,135		14		459	1,048
CALIFORNIA	701,541	595,765	72,810	9,036		3,396	20,534
COLORADO	76,568	71,254	1,822	148		421	2,923
CONNECTICUT	68,061	55,083	9,748	78		360	2,792
DELAWARE	18,855	17,372	492				991
FLORIDA	307,100	299,575	7	719		971	5,828
GEORGIA	297,720	293,871		42		1,239	2,568
HAWAII	26,044	19,465	6,136				443
IDAHO	25,094	23,716	662	40		52	624
ILLINOIS	381,432	302,311	68,897	554	13	2,005	7,652
INDIANA	132,306	123,484	2,352	557		1,316	4,597
IOWA	80,493	72,000	5,759	40		218	2,476
KANSAS	69,156	64,621	2,258	251		316	1,710
KENTUCKY	213,517	208,462	149	194		1,064	3,648
LOUISIAN.	313,340	308,850	13	54		564	3,859
MAINE	39,601	36,308	1,352	35		155	1,751
MARYLAND	124,537	116,951	725	148	200	416	6,097
MASSACHUSETTS	144,018	116,900	21,255	215	38	867	4,743
MICHIGAN	314,245	220,485	80,692	1,806		952	10,310
MINNESOTA	112,759	98,936	8,951	726		432	3,714
MISSISSIPPI	263,690	261,679		24		554	1,433
MISSOURI	178,757	172,955	497	806	69	683	3,747
MONTANA	25,956	24,989				293	674
NEBRASKA	47,873	45,952	544	52		241	1,084
NEVADA	11,559	10,890	48	154		154	313
NEW HAMPSHIRE	16,150	14,286	732	37		165	930
NEW JERSEY	196,745	155,690	32,380	586		482	7,607
NEW MEXICO	81,749	80,559		6		395	789
NEW YORK	740,267	526,402	172,332	1,542	1,403	8,463	30,125
NORTH CAROLINA	319,147	312,545	10			1,890	4,702
NORTH DAKOTA	28,558	27,354	632	68		45	459
OHIO	290,799	273,542	5,213	632		2,721	8,691
OKLAHOMA	124,872	122,548	413	128		1,284	499
OREGON	65,561	53,953	7,802	461			3,345
PENNSYLVANIA	365,296	304,815	45,552	934		4,019	9,976
RHODE ISLAND	28,145	24,482	2,620	25		154	864
SOUTH CAROLINA	209,131	206,985		9		776	1,361
SOUTH DAKOTA	35,568	33,815	493	95		388	777
TENNESSEE	249,112	245,157		137		1,294	2,524
TEXAS	645,362	636,776		288		4,087	4,211
UTAH	34,250	30,796	2,121	136		67	1,130
VERMONT	15,296	13,062	1,444			159	631
VIRGINIA	223,932	214,357	320			669	8,586
WASHINGTON	96,514	80,172	11,127	657		936	3,622
WEST VIRGINIA	108,791	106,359	7	56	16	339	2,014
WISCONSIN	126,860	103,895	15,904	323		787	5,951
WYOMING	10,438	10,054		30		153	201
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	42,106	37,193	4,014				809
AMERICAN SAMOA							
GUAM							
PUERTO RICO							
TRUST TERRITORY							
VIRGIN ISLANDS							

APPENDIX D

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION FUNDS: FEDERAL MONIES

	1974	1975	1976	1977
TOTALS	1,719,500,000	1,876,000,000	1,900,000,000	2,050,000,000
1. Alabama	38,101,787	42,665,460	43,831,536	46,856,194
2. Alaska	5,158,151	5,354,022	5,622,262	6,414,381
3. Arizona	11,432,682	16,753,134	16,824,077	20,785,846
4. Arkansas	24,298,742	26,492,824	27,183,459	29,388,487
5. California	140,274,925	155,136,489	154,142,773	171,556,617
6. Colorado	14,581,384	17,416,659	17,530,600	18,864,321
7. Connecticut	17,271,134	17,633,309	19,672,741	19,873,823
8. Delaware	3,721,680	5,455,829	5,686,912	5,989,339
9. District of Columbia	14,181,350	11,988,435	11,988,435	12,451,797
10. Florida	40,974,842	63,842,581	67,229,983	81,023,365
11. Georgia	44,699,611	46,987,049	48,060,346	51,701,581
12. Hawaii	4,751,550	5,349,677	5,873,732	5,960,644
13. Idaho	4,059,825	5,856,473	6,126,382	6,916,580
14. Illinois	87,775,305	95,555,470	91,454,909	101,549,806
15. Indiana	22,973,436	25,251,097	25,377,862	27,114,681
16. Iowa	16,658,419	16,211,978	16,376,563	16,595,598
17. Kansas	11,938,966	14,125,396	14,398,290	15,377,971
18. Kentucky	34,697,284	33,571,199	34,008,000	38,187,889
19. Louisiana	37,018,529	52,060,593	51,736,260	56,061,676
20. Maine	7,082,691	7,122,142	7,604,112	8,662,288
21. Maryland	27,043,173	31,153,223	31,659,701	34,183,719
22. Massachusetts	32,964,736	36,994,988	37,194,692	42,268,394
23. Michigan	73,845,675	80,358,696	85,884,229	90,041,996
24. Minnesota	25,659,442	29,384,988	29,244,217	31,899,426
25. Mississippi	39,763,894	41,051,606	42,544,658	46,115,961
26. Missouri	27,164,620	32,462,521	32,571,143	34,678,447
27. Montana	4,627,916	6,199,645	6,656,693	7,440,778
28. Nebraska	8,228,691	9,350,494	9,333,939	10,024,081
29. Nevada	1,547,647	2,457,300	2,525,292	2,827,541
30. New Hampshire	2,880,038	3,445,039	3,631,662	3,715,312
31. New Jersey	63,852,752	59,270,639	58,747,452	58,033,106
32. New Mexico	9,620,140	15,977,253	16,051,512	18,951,500
33. New York	247,563,367	216,221,313	200,246,891	204,068,799
34. North Carolina	59,007,242	54,086,377	54,927,150	59,582,110
35. North Dakota	5,515,417	5,704,539	5,717,078	5,954,059
36. Ohio	54,911,401	59,706,338	57,552,565	59,937,461
37. Oklahoma	19,504,095	21,087,184	21,362,408	22,643,692
38. Oregon	13,205,109	17,755,684	18,330,685	20,939,866
39. Pennsylvania	80,935,205	90,759,713	91,187,557	94,121,451
40. Rhode Island	5,891,099	6,826,385	7,185,825	7,328,661
41. South Carolina	34,129,109	34,130,376	34,730,566	36,992,607
42. South Dakota	6,182,094	6,338,901	6,157,374	6,409,994
43. Tennessee	14,880,289	39,388,545	40,319,507	43,132,809
44. Texas	97,510,084	123,562,744	125,573,876	147,992,810
45. Utah	5,634,606	6,345,851	6,424,831	6,993,369
46. Vermont	4,447,063	4,155,849	4,592,101	4,843,103
47. Virginia	35,677,248	39,272,349	41,465,674	44,464,610
48. Washington	20,172,510	25,511,739	25,972,188	27,271,157
49. West Virginia	19,197,951	17,681,155	17,805,315	18,946,931
50. Wisconsin	24,069,161	30,025,049	32,002,734	32,782,836
51. Wyoming	1,970,105	2,991,964	3,015,161	3,252,910
52. American Samoa	385,065	408,440	408,440	408,440
53. Guam	1,048,721	1,111,590	1,124,816	1,196,608
54. Puerto Rico	31,837,390	29,410,052	39,174,357	48,007,936
55. Trust Territory	1,177,995	1,244,150	1,244,150	1,244,150
56. Virgin Islands	649,764	688,377	688,733	672,470

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, P.L. 89-10 As Amended

Title I, Assistance for Educationally Deprived Children

Allotments for Fiscal Year 1977

	PART A								PART B – $24,769,000		GRAND TOTAL	
	Local Educational Agencies	Handicapped Children	Juvenile Delinquents	Adult Correctional Institutions	Neglected Children	Migrant Children[1]	Administration	Total Part A	Special Incentive	Administration	Total Administration	Grand Total
TOTALS	1,721,130,372	111,433,451	19,054,654	7,833,015	1,952,882	130,900,332	21,105,611	2,013,500,217	24,523,762	245,238	21,430,649	2,050,000,000
ALABAMA	44,786,457	656,016	199,129	39,363		711,306	463,923	46,856,194			463,923	46,856,194
ALASKA	1,422,869	1,491,880	86,993				137,374	5,139,116	1,262,639	12,626	150,000	6,414,381
ARIZONA	15,716,951	592,077	299,156	35,224		3,264,290	199,077	20,106,775	672,348	6,723	205,800	20,785,846
ARKANSAS	25,668,518	355,977	199,592	90,775		1,982,950	290,975	29,388,687			290,975	29,388,687
CALIFORNIA	139,880,257	3,263,228	1,448,082	280,885		24,985,585	1,698,580	171,556,617			1,698,580	171,556,617
COLORADO	14,880,642	1,695,827	157,451	24,754		1,721,393	184,801	18,664,868	197,678	1,975	186,776	18,864,321
CONNECTICUT	16,108,837	1,771,724	105,694	408,828	49,780	1,232,389	196,771	19,873,823			196,771	19,873,823
DELAWARE	4,326,160	930,718	158,130			315,216	148,909	5,879,133	109,115	1,091	150,000	5,989,339
FLORIDA	59,626,824	2,478,095	621,467	582,567		16,912,200	802,212	81,023,365			802,212	81,023,365
GEORGIA	48,424,650	972,781	485,318	247,125		1,059,810	511,897	51,701,581			511,897	51,701,581
HAWAII	5,397,993	381,663	25,872	5,116			150,000	5,960,644			150,000	5,960,644
IDAHO	4,079,797	239,469	59,739	32,718		2,354,857	150,000	6,916,580			150,000	6,916,580
ILLINOIS	89,121,643	9,770,786	568,153	103,530	120,981	359,469	1,005,444	101,549,806			1,005,444	101,549,806
INDIANA	22,641,302	2,304,621	287,485	233,526	179,679	1,004,406	268,462	27,114,681			268,462	27,114,681
IOWA	15,250,265	756,184	131,305	103,998	83,128	106,605	164,313	16,595,598			164,313	16,595,598
KANSAS	13,234,019	1,107,698	152,562	85,289		646,474	152,257	15,377,971			152,257	15,377,971
KENTUCKY	34,713,991	908,674	176,628	77,032		933,666	378,098	38,187,889			378,098	38,187,889
LOUISIANA	51,287,225	2,161,190	439,472	27,102		502,854	544,178	54,962,021	1,088,768	10,687	554,865	56,061,676
MAINE	8,526,318	730,816	129,202	46,180		728,188	146,686	8,307,390	351,384	3,514	150,000	8,662,288
MARYLAND	29,463,487	2,185,631	505,279	231,967		950,419	333,360	33,670,151	508,483	5,085	338,453	34,183,719
MASSACHUSETTS	32,130,614	6,620,715	382,480	152,881		1,562,339	408,480	41,387,323	1,001,060	10,011	418,499	42,268,394
MICHIGAN	72,392,647	7,354,557	338,026	701,286	16,432	4,668,979	854,719	86,358,646	3,678,564	36,786	891,505	90,041,996
MINNESOTA	26,285,705	777,402	319,131	190,938		969,741	285,429	28,828,346	3,040,674	30,406	315,835	31,899,426
MISSISSIPPI	42,869,685	619,613	250,069	90,285		1,129,715	456,594	46,115,961			456,594	46,115,961
MISSOURI	30,687,282	2,134,901	310,733	106,974		1,099,286	343,351	34,678,647			343,351	34,678,647
MONTANA	5,254,480	372,368	98,505	2,862		872,462	143,095	6,743,422	690,651	6,905	150,000	7,440,778
NEBRASKA	9,100,166	345,267	88,450	28,526	22,261	389,631	150,000	10,024,081			150,000	10,024,081
NEVADA	2,089,667	361,274	105,121	29,989		92,490	150,000	2,827,541			150,000	2,827,541
NEW HAMPSHIRE	2,803,560	677,470	84,282				150,000	3,715,312			150,000	3,715,312
NEW JERSEY	47,970,659	4,677,050	739,831	54,300		2,279,346	557,292	56,300,678	1,729,335	17,293	574,585	58,033,106
NEW MEXICO	13,391,518	394,923	137,075	36,722		2,427,294	163,875	16,551,407	2,376,330	23,763	187,638	18,951,500
NEW YORK	180,523,103	11,275,585	2,771,434	778,015		3,021,614	1,903,898	200,353,649	3,678,564	36,786	2,020,684	204,068,799
NORTH CAROLINA	51,885,667	3,295,736	773,823	444,383		2,592,579	589,922	59,582,110			589,922	59,582,110
NORTH DAKOTA	4,664,858	294,526	58,812	23,154		762,709	150,000	5,954,059			150,000	5,954,059
OHIO	51,107,975	5,560,236	884,390	142,819	131,981	1,516,620	593,440	59,937,661			593,440	59,937,661
OKLAHOMA	20,301,200	697,253	171,872	204,686	253,460	791,026	224,195	22,643,692			224,195	22,643,692
OREGON	14,709,272	1,973,301	450,945	90,375		2,649,088	108,735	20,977,216	859,059	8,991	207,326	20,939,866
PENNSYLVANIA	83,201,106	7,520,917	760,365	339,808	244,036	823,898	928,901	93,819,031	290,626	2,994	931,895	94,121,451
RHODE ISLAND	6,550,719	545,074	26,088	23,716	33,064		150,000	7,328,661			150,000	7,328,661
SOUTH CAROLINA	33,999,697	1,214,272	301,472	378,345	88,450	644,158	366,263	36,992,607			366,263	36,992,607
SOUTH DAKOTA	5,793,471	341,530	51,866	35,617		37,510	150,000	6,409,994			150,000	6,409,994
TENNESSEE	40,500,671	900,002	484,141	259,672	238,954	322,311	427,058	43,132,809			427,058	43,132,809
TEXAS	104,926,030	6,572,512	966,669	262,157	316,754	33,483,613	1,465,275	147,993,810			1,465,275	147,993,810
UTAH	5,568,683	400,110	106,976	7,873		263,961	145,042	6,492,643	495,768	4,958	150,000	6,643,103
VERMONT	3,053,648	1,011,546	63,643	10,680		28,988	144,752	4,313,057	524,798	5,248	150,000	4,463,057
VIRGINIA	39,979,387	2,310,117	549,688	398,257		778,917	440,244	44,464,610			440,244	44,464,610
WASHINGTON	20,069,080	1,447,501	367,179	162,713		4,616,192	264,627	26,727,292	538,480	5,385	270,012	27,271,157
WEST VIRGINIA	17,686,814	546,235	238,491	63,011	25,470	209,017	187,593	18,946,931			187,593	18,946,931
WISCONSIN	27,146,124	2,905,141	432,661	95,939		734,020	313,139	31,627,024	1,144,368	11,444	124,583	32,782,836
WYOMING	2,207,965	275,538	49,957	11,852		280,928	147,233	2,975,473	276,670	2,767	150,000	3,252,910
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	10,268,060	1,599,430	285,835		148,472		150,000	12,451,797			150,000	12,451,797
AMERICAN SAMOA	383,440						25,000	408,440			25,000	408,440
GUAM	1,015,694	155,914					25,000	1,196,608			25,000	1,196,608
PUERTO RICO	46,811,547	292,978	173,281	61,181		193,223	475,326	48,007,936			475,326	48,007,936
TRUST TERRITORY	1,179,150						25,000	1,244,150			25,000	1,244,150
VIRGIN ISLANDS	647,470						25,000	672,470			25,000	672,470
Dept. of Interior	17,567,233							17,567,233				17,567,233
Education & Welfare												11,500,000
Undistributed												130,753

[1] $2.3 million of this amount is reserved for the Migrant Student Record Transfer System.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, P.L. 89-10 As Amended
Title I, Assistance for Educationally Deprived Children
Allotments for Fiscal Year 1976

APPENDIX

	PART A								PART B - $16,538,000		GRAND TOTAL	
	Local Educational Agencies	Handicapped Children	Juvenile Delinquents	Adult Correctional Institutions	Neglected Children	Migrant Children[1]	Administration	Total Part A	Special Incentive	Administration	Total Administration	Grand Total
TOTALS	1,625,412,679	95,868,643	18,090,832	7,284,243	2,084,369	97,090,678	19,792,971	1,865,624,215	16,374,257	163,743	19,956,714	1,900,000,000
ALABAMA	41,814,255	633,507	199,129	39,363		711,306	433,976	43,831,536			433,976	43,831,536
ALASKA	1,340,573	1,491,880	61,396	4,408	25,505		144,606	5,077,660	539,408	5,394	150,000	5,622,262
ARIZONA	13,675,036	530,238	299,156	13,685		2,136,387	166,575	16,824,077			166,575	16,824,077
ARKANSAS	23,806,079	1,201,718	199,592	159,157		1,547,770	269,143	27,183,459			269,143	27,183,459
CALIFORNIA	130,039,420	2,026,019	1,448,082	263,546		18,039,540	1,526,166	154,142,773			1,526,166	154,142,773
COLORADO	13,772,261	1,538,868	157,451	19,303		1,523,566	170,114	17,181,543	345,601	3,456	173,570	17,530,600
CONNECTICUT	16,196,042	1,520,891	105,494	462,844	49,780	941,575	192,766	19,469,392	201,336	2,013	194,779	19,672,741
DELAWARE	4,110,183	843,255	158,110			315,216	148,899	5,575,683	110,128	1,101	150,000	5,686,912
FLORIDA	50,503,034	2,097,705	621,467	582,567		12,759,567	665,643	67,229,983			665,643	67,229,983
GEORGIA	45,357,803	781,233	485,318	215,100		745,047	475,845	48,060,346			475,845	48,060,346
HAWAII	5,392,197	302,795	23,624	5,116			150,000	5,873,732			150,000	5,873,732
IDAHO	3,843,995	222,260	59,739	25,553		1,824,835	150,000	6,126,382			150,000	6,126,382
ILLINOIS	82,558,717	6,473,167	568,153	103,530	120,981	724,867	905,494	91,454,909			905,494	91,454,909
INDIANA	21,565,768	2,115,908	282,485	233,526	179,679	729,830	251,266	25,377,862			251,266	25,377,862
IOWA	15,090,203	756,184	131,305	52,523	83,128	101,076	162,144	16,376,563			162,144	16,376,563
KANSAS	12,269,304	1,107,450	139,853	85,209		646,474	150,000	14,398,290			150,000	14,398,290
KENTUCKY	32,426,766	896,867	125,845	75,428	31,393	114,988	336,713	34,008,000			336,713	34,008,000
LOUISIANA	47,732,141	2,161,190	439,472	23,802		488,560	508,452	51,353,617	378,854	3,789	512,241	51,736,260
MAINE	6,095,298	609,614	129,202	26,648		298,968	147,054	7,306,584	294,582	2,946	150,000	7,604,112
MARYLAND	27,832,475	1,393,807	505,279	231,967		950,419	311,139	31,425,086	232,292	2,323	313,462	31,659,701
MASSACHUSETTS	30,364,592	4,523,563	318,475	117,114		1,168,360	364,921	36,857,025	334,324	3,343	368,264	37,194,692
MICHIGAN	70,850,778	6,462,928	299,881	474,449	14,628	4,479,087	825,778	83,403,529	2,456,139	24,561	850,339	85,884,529
MINNESOTA	24,645,701	1,157,076	319,131	190,938		519,634	268,325	27,100,805	2,122,190	21,222	289,547	29,244,217
MISSISSIPPI	40,030,517	587,830	250,069	54,391		1,200,617	421,234	42,544,658			421,234	42,544,658
MISSOURI	29,117,891	1,922,592	310,733	106,974		790,466	322,487	32,571,143			322,487	32,571,143
MONTANA	4,828,797	352,811	87,987	1,158	50,477	872,462	146,870	6,340,562	313,001	3,130	150,000	6,656,693
NEBRASKA	8,435,710	334,814	88,450	19,326	16,208	289,431	150,000	9,333,939			150,000	9,333,939
NEVADA	2,007,856	207,564	105,121	15,851		38,900	150,000	2,525,292			150,000	2,525,292
NEW HAMPSHIRE	2,822,661	550,638	84,282			24,081	150,000	3,631,662			150,000	3,631,662
NEW JERSEY	49,173,844	4,240,295	739,831	54,300		2,279,346	564,876	57,052,495	1,678,175	16,782	581,658	58,747,662
NEW MEXICO	12,447,191	382,050	137,075	5,406		2,427,296	153,991	15,553,087	693,690	4,935	158,926	16,051,512
NEW YORK	180,180,252	10,014,256	1,903,367	578,015		2,932,220	1,958,081	197,766,191	2,456,139	24,561	1,982,642	200,246,891
NORTH CAROLINA	48,615,109	2,744,278	771,823	389,498		1,860,609	543,833	54,927,150			543,833	54,927,150
NORTH DAKOTA	4,627,877	294,526	58,812	23,154		762,709	150,000	5,717,078			150,000	5,717,078
OHIO	49,190,897	5,154,655	884,390	104,195	131,981	1,516,620	569,827	57,552,565			569,827	57,552,565
OKLAHOMA	19,069,470	697,253	154,672	204,686	251,458	773,360	211,509	21,362,408			211,509	21,362,408
OREGON	13,368,764	1,642,303	341,737	77,624	34,277	1,974,916	174,396	17,614,017	709,572	7,096	181,492	18,330,685
PENNSYLVANIA	81,400,648	6,442,840	760,365	339,808	244,036	631,411	898,191	90,717,299	465,602	4,656	902,847	91,187,557
RHODE ISLAND	6,429,923	532,501	23,505	13,432	31,064	3,100	150,000	7,185,825			150,000	7,185,825
SOUTH CAROLINA	31,760,052	1,214,222	401,472	378,345	88,450	644,158	343,867	34,730,566			343,867	34,730,566
SOUTH DAKOTA	5,557,851	341,530	51,866	18,617		37,510	150,000	6,157,374			150,000	6,157,374
TENNESSEE	37,862,844	878,018	459,385	158,792	238,954	322,311	36,203	40,319,507			790,303	40,319,507
TEXAS	97,850,649	5,534,851	966,469	225,960	316,354	19,435,887	1,763,306	125,573,876			1,243,306	125,573,876
UTAH	5,235,063	400,110	106,974	7,873		263,961	147,392	6,161,403	260,820	2,608	150,000	6,424,831
VERMONT	2,923,360	899,381	63,443	6,666		23,999	144,747	4,061,596	525,252	5,253	150,000	4,592,101
VIRGINIA	37,066,971	2,261,290	549,688	398,257		778,917	410,551	41,465,674			410,551	41,465,674
WASHINGTON	19,343,478	1,416,802	367,179	162,713		3,730,390	250,206	25,270,768	694,475	6,945	257,151	25,972,188
WEST VIRGINIA	16,577,023	546,235	238,491	32,489	25,470	209,317	176,290	17,805,315			176,290	17,805,315
WISCONSIN	25,963,621	2,904,867	432,661	77,836	43,729	314,020	301,567	30,458,301	1,529,140	15,292	316,859	32,002,734
WYOMING	2,032,540	256,147	49,957	11,852		280,928	147,663	2,779,087	233,737	2,337	150,000	3,015,161
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	10,691,492	1,390,803	262,746		104,327		150,000	12,599,368			150,000	12,599,368
AMERICAN SAMOA	383,440						25,000	408,440			25,000	408,440
GUAM	1,015,694	84,122					25,000	1,124,816			25,000	1,124,816
PUERTO RICO	36,872,690	571,453	442,714	211,169		688,466	387,865	39,174,357			387,865	39,174,357
TRUST TERRITORY	1,219,150						25,000	1,244,150			25,000	1,244,150
VIRGIN ISLANDS	647,470		15,907				25,000	688,377			25,000	688,377
DEPT. OF INTERIOR	17,567,233							17,567,233				17,567,233
Evaluation & Studies												17,500,000
Undistributed												337,784

[1] $1.7 million of this amount reserved for the Migrant Student Record Transfer System.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Office of Education
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, P.L. 89-10, As Amended
Title I. Assistance for Educationally Deprived Children
Allotments for Fiscal Year 1975

APPENDIX G

	PART A								PART B - $11,000,000		PART C - $50,000,000			
	Local Educational Agencies	Handicapped Children	Juvenile Delinquents	Adult Correctional Institutions	Neglected Children	Migratory Children	Administration	Total Part A	Special Incentive	Administration	Special Grants	Administration	Total Administration	Grand Total
TOTALS	1,947,168,967	47,861,520	19,062,891	6,734,291	12,425,793	41,953,160	19,811,687	2,015,018,309	13,861,386	138,614	37,623,761	376,239	19,826,540	1,576,300,000 1,965,118,089
ALABAMA	40,339,739	833,907	399,129	39,383		711,306	419,240	41,742,774			319,486	3,230	422,470	42,165,460
ALASKA	3,225,765	464,114	96,993	4,405			42,777	3,827,457	140,716	1,407	51,826	519	192,000	5,374,302
ARIZONA	33,343,262	1,102,216	299,136	17,194		3,104,281	481,706	38,347,795			558,748	5,597	547,877	38,795,734
ARKANSAS	22,990,111	1,201,718	194,592	80,775		1,439,911	260,725	26,167,832			308,405	3,064	372,305	26,492,824
CALIFORNIA	226,081,203	2,026,019	449,28	81,421		17,947,908	2,499,856	150,575,489			4,114,831	47,149	3,136,207	153,136,489
COLORADO	13,104,183	1,104,940	157,451	17,909		1,123,566	167,419	16,406,270	77,061	771	425,250	4,253	172,443	17,416,659
CONNECTICUT	13,831,798	1,546,473	189,494	427,040	49,260	726,842	199,769	16,625,810	51,633	517	750,129	7,501	174,567	17,633,309
DELAWARE	3,445,736	523,164	58,130			315,218	87,449	4,345,899	28,743	287			150,300	4,455,829
FLORIDA	47,564,074	2,057,972	632,467	36,367		11,447,502	622,936	62,916,318			918,894	9,189	632,105	63,842,581
GEORGIA	44,014,055	981,533	495,118	142,897		963,581	490,368	46,487,340			697,309	6,850	667,218	46,987,389
HAWAII	4,697,450	261,993	23,624	41	20,608		147,994	5,147,100			200,170	2,002	150,300	5,349,677
IDAHO	3,693,052	140,106	58,734	23,307		1,870,125	49,150	5,790,764			67,079	650	150,300	5,856,475
ILLINOIS	84,361,763	3,479,346	968,737	187,530	120,38	574,867	1,012,599	91,905,234			1,331,694	13,317	966,394	95,555,470
INDIANA	21,071,832	944,374	261,495	191,738	79,679	724,630	340,351	24,564,106			399,98	4,000	250,011	25,781,097
IOWA	14,595,224	796,184	171,305	47,990	83,129	181,078	237,829	16,438,739	55,404	554	233,715	2,337	162,515	16,721,378
KANSAS	11,747,773	1,102,617	139,953	65,209		940,474	147,465	13,969,391			251,470	2,535	150,300	14,125,396
KENTUCKY	31,939,341	711,696	339,793	71,428		88,313	359,361	33,283,934			382,678	3,827	332,068	33,571,199
LOUISIANA	47,147,448	2,111,141	439,471	50,859		455,360	502,595	50,707,013	732,463	7,325	567,215	5,672	515,472	52,060,593
MAINE	8,727,287	537,557	129,201	33,529	12,514	140,522	87,309	9,820,119	237,984	2,379	61,485	615	150,300	9,732,145
MARYLAND	26,756,951	1,361,100	505,276	231,961		450,419	308,337	30,114,074	736,745	7,367	852,314	8,523	508,447	31,153,253
MASSACHUSETTS	30,292,760	3,627,807	272,919	74,870		626,179	445,843	35,233,127	219,440	2,194	1,524,877	15,250	566,287	36,994,488
MICHIGAN	63,845,083	5,799,116	594,514	474,449	14,265	4,475,087	949,028	75,651,542	2,079,208	20,792	2,581,364	25,814	795,630	80,258,696
MINNESOTA	16,155,403	676,396	318,111	196,438		454,145	263,980	17,863,073	1,739,156	17,392	556,894	5,569	290,941	19,384,986
MISSISSIPPI	28,543,549	491,175	282,869	43,267		340,563	403,727	30,775,444			272,438	2,724	406,451	31,051,608
MISSOURI	28,641,389	1,869,958	310,753	109,574		657,838	513,689	31,904,779			512,220	5,122	321,411	32,462,321
MONTANA	4,500,873	324,626	87,947	1,139	30,477	871,461	87,890	5,903,563	142,109	1,421	99,651	997	150,300	6,199,645
NEBRASKA	8,337,465	348,514	88,450		16,208	369,431	85,679	9,245,827			134,126	1,341	150,300	9,350,466
NEVADA	1,951,005	142,107	60,123	4,870		19,900	49,447	2,427,452			33,264	333	150,300	2,457,300
NEW HAMPSHIRE	2,741,951	177,792	44,281			24,28	49,350	3,037,426			64,963	650	150,300	3,445,209
NEW JERSEY	47,673,165	4,140,598	709,811	74,308		2,276,340	949,869	55,536,929	1,092,402	10,924	2,604,479	26,044	986,837	58,270,630
NEW MEXICO	12,008,797	982,090	137,075			2,427,294	99,792	15,124,928	691,951	6,920	193,955	1,939	158,191	15,977,253
NEW YORK	191,866,701	10,306,146	1,901,367	774,013		13,932,208	3,774,454	206,561,211	2,079,208	20,792	4,114,851	41,149	2,140,805	216,721,213
NORTH CAROLINA	47,964,345	2,218,034	772,825	335,166		1,507,366	833,568	53,568,992			832,401	8,324	935,133	54,386,359
NORTH DAKOTA	4,277,110	194,126	58,812	23,154		762,709	89,620	5,996,131			58,029	580	150,300	6,704,139
OHIO	90,025,149	5,154,635	833,414	264,145	131,68	3,476,620	1,199,482	101,243,686			1,347,185	13,472	891,192	91,700,358
OKLAHOMA	19,330,328	650,05	344,672	204,990	251,458	775,360	396,510	20,857,473			227,437	2,274	208,764	21,087,184
OREGON	13,863,539	1,191,165	176,014	77,634		1,447,762	168,364	17,025,477	399,568	3,89	333,883	3,339	175,799	17,793,664
PENNSYLVANIA	78,157,314	5,409,150	760,363	208,197	144,336	633,4	861,761	87,097,723	1,359,037	13,590	2,326,197	23,266	898,611	90,759,713
RHODE ISLAND	5,872,750	511,414	73,8	11,413	10,064	1,08	67,301	6,581,881			141,984	1,420	150,300	6,826,185
SOUTH CAROLINA	30,881,029	1,214,227	387,472	175,140	99,450	644,178	510,067	33,943,563			293,993	2,939	337,925	34,130,376
SOUTH DAKOTA	3,677,625	333,425	51,866	10,568		83,810	49,221	4,260,215			77,959	779	150,300	4,338,901
TENNESSEE	36,942,586	678,014	494,361	135,930	238,954	592,111	466,268	39,818,032			571,795	5,718	599,986	39,388,545
TEXAS	14,397,938	3,514,451	966,469	369,301	316,704	14,435,849	1,208,185	135,207,877			450,458	4,509	1,223,394	153,562,744
UTAH	5,289,490	400,110	126,374	7,871		263,961	140,750	6,017,638	171,340	1,716	155,152	1,554	150,300	6,345,851
VERMONT	2,791,653	74,765	43,44	4,144		10,454	46,25	2,760,370	166,574	1,667	25,186	251	150,300	4,133,549
VIRGINIA	35,346,213	1,226,266	549,169	199,257		778,977	587,992	39,087,153			584,352	5,844	588,836	39,772,349
WASHINGTON	18,740,492	1,479,663	367,750	142,753		1,410,499	341,306	24,481,950	429,251	4,293	658,910	6,594	559,995	25,511,756
WEST VIRGINIA	16,164,525	479,963	138,491	50,107	25,470	291,337	173,225	17,496,586			183,225	1,832	175,861	17,684,155
WISCONSIN	19,147,751	2,135,188	411,641	71,568	43,774	734,020	302,873	28,368,741	1,144,307	11,443	495,449	4,954	297,277	30,025,289
WYOMING	1,949,328	102,033	49,197	11,852		340,024	47,722	2,791,420	107,826	1,078	30,140	302	150,300	2,991,964
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	9,870,073	1,067,274	262,740		104,307		42,990	11,347,280			734,955	7,349	150,300	11,498,435
AMERICAN SAMOA	381,440						25,000	406,440					25,000	406,440
GUAM	1,085,890	70,896					25,000	1,181,786					25,000	1,181,786
PUERTO RICO	27,368,926	977,473	442,714	211,369		536,06	581,369	29,410,052					581,369	29,410,052
TRUST TERRITORY	1,219,150						25,000	1,244,150					25,000	1,244,150
VIRGIN ISLANDS	647,470		15,907				25,000	688,377					25,000	688,377
Dept. of Interior	17,567,233					290,000		17,567,233						17,567,233
Outlying Areas								200,000						200,000
Evaluation and Studies														9,850,000
Undistributed														1,031,817

[1] 1/4 million of this amount reserved for the Migrant Student Record Transfer System.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Office of Education
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, P.L. 89-10, As Amended
Title I, Assistance for Educationally Deprived Children
Allotments for Fiscal Year 1974

APPENDIX H

	PART A								PART B	PART C			GRAND TOTAL	
	Local Educational Agencies	Handicapped Children (State Agencies)	Juvenile Delinquents in Institutions (State Agencies)	Children in Community Day Schools (State Agencies)	Migratory Children (State Agencies)	State Administration	PART A TOTAL	PART B Special Incentive Grants	Local Educational Agencies	Administration	PART C TOTAL	ADMINISTRATION	TOTAL
GRAND TOTAL	1,440,152,865	65,577,778	17,511,353	894,000	2,801,340	78,310,417	1,605,247,753	14,949,016	637,758,769	127,855,213	765,613,982	54,739,237	5,445,150	60,184,387	1,431,005,000	1,431,005,000
50 States & D.C.	1,396,952,646	63,614,430	17,261,412	867,120	2,801,340	78,310,417	1,559,807,365	14,949,016	621,955,794	127,855,213	749,811,007	54,739,237	5,445,150	60,184,387	1,374,000,000	1,374,000,000
ALABAMA	34,149,156	651,567	194,129	19,740		711,306	35,725,898	361,329	14,493,796		14,493,796	1,192,071	15,920	1,207,991	377,245	38,101,787
ALASKA	2,898,078	464,714	46,360				3,409,152	150,000	4,594,180	493,314	5,087,494	65,252		65,252	150,000	5,302,746
ARIZONA	8,221,631	708,238	196,136	12,199		2,140,281	11,278,485	150,000	11,316,887		11,316,887	115,799		115,799	150,000	11,582,686
ARKANSAS	20,961,818	1,201,718	199,592	24,361		703,840	23,091,329	150,000	21,187,443		21,187,443	903,274	9,033	912,307	240,082	24,390,860
CALIFORNIA	157,340,149	4,026,209	445,196	19,927		10,076,834	171,908,315	1,240,799	80,477,183	160,932	80,638,115	3,049,812	16,498	3,066,310	1,187,267	140,274,925
COLORADO	18,933,510	1,558,460	137,431			1,123,566	21,752,967	150,000	14,389,375	44,160	14,433,535	233,849		233,849	150,000	14,583,384
CONNECTICUT	14,067,011	1,316,693	105,894		40,080	726,611	16,256,289	164,457	16,960,613	132,295	17,092,908	294,264	2,942	297,206	167,886	17,257,194
DELAWARE	2,251,429	876,257	108,150			353,038	3,588,874	150,000	3,623,481	44,436	3,667,917	53,793		53,793	150,000	3,701,680
FLORIDA	75,780,647	2,027,972	82,401	182,760		2,147,402	80,221,182	387,134	40,999,170		40,999,170	566,795	9,068	575,863	405,692	40,974,862
GEORGIA	40,771,811	781,233	481,318	152,147		537,146	42,723,655	415,197	42,996,362		42,996,362	1,430,386	16,861	1,447,247	442,270	44,899,611
HAWAII	4,106,357	751,220	73,634		20,629		4,951,840	150,000	4,592,138		4,592,138	99,446		99,446	150,000	4,751,584
IDAHO	3,758,220	196,150	30,704	21,267		404,109	4,410,450	150,000	4,059,825		4,059,825				150,000	4,059,825
ILLINOIS	77,164,927	5,475,784	568,153		55,081	734,867	83,998,812	541,743	85,100,772		85,100,772	2,645,253	28,680	2,673,933	569,362	87,774,705
INDIANA	19,777,479	1,441,170	91,481	192,708	176,978	1,276,870	22,956,686	533,697	21,534,739	121,796	21,656,535	319,905	3,196	323,108	226,216	22,973,643
IOWA	14,861,661	716,134	111,307		43,029	1,147,402	16,879,533	158,714	15,830,088	704,364	16,534,452	103,017	1,030	104,047	157,764	16,692,499
KANSAS	9,631,813	1,032,467	178,853	63,106		340,474	11,246,713	150,000	11,706,126		11,706,126	182,640		182,640	150,000	11,938,766
KENTUCKY	32,212,768	1,712,696		52,591		59,913	34,037,968	150,786	31,806,748		31,806,748	1,277,759	12,777	1,290,536	340,137	34,097,284
LOUISIANA	31,722,497	2,231,181	439,472	25,870		488,560	34,907,580	444,259	34,746,125	1,890,431	36,636,556	1,254,980	12,560	1,267,540	356,615	37,018,256
MAINE	3,647,299	559,102	176,202	12,903		64,833	4,460,339	150,000	4,644,253	447,714	5,091,967	90,724		90,724	150,000	5,092,691
MARYLAND	22,681,313	1,280,781	151,268	25,867		350,419	24,489,648	314,440	23,902,579	325,682	24,228,261	505,891	8,069	514,960	264,530	24,993,191
MASSACHUSETTS	28,106,364	2,794,662	152,282	14,970		292,870	31,361,148	619,250	32,244,295		32,244,295	713,403	7,134	720,437	326,384	32,964,735
MICHIGAN	58,917,963	4,409	794,914	474,440	14,267	1,179,140	61,384,933	665,917	64,188,677	2,679,267	66,867,944	1,567,108	15,631	1,582,739	504,628	68,955,311
MINNESOTA	20,497,139	1,678,380	91,179	40,108		1,179,140	23,485,946	225,166	22,761,644	2,246,017	25,007,661	546,523	5,465	551,988	230,826	25,659,449
MISSISSIPPI	19,932,628	494,140	180,864	41,267		340,567	20,989,466	177,506	21,123,416		21,123,416	1,619,283	16,193	1,635,476	391,702	23,763,892
MISSOURI	31,397,502	1,869,958	310,751	36,974		454,194	34,069,379	361,356	34,381,108		34,381,108	772,704	7,728	780,432	268,957	35,104,620
MONTANA	3,861,342	124,629	87,267		50,477	872,402	4,996,117	150,000	4,351,294	256,827	4,608,121	19,995		19,995	150,000	4,627,816
NEBRASKA	7,187,130	154,814	58,430		16,108	299,414	7,715,896	150,000	5,066,417		5,066,417	162,258		162,258	150,000	5,228,675
NEVADA	1,208,674	130,128	105,123	14,974		35,900	1,494,799	150,000	547,647		547,647				150,000	547,647
NEW HAMPSHIRE	2,273,893	147,790	94,292			34,281	2,550,256	150,000	636,018		636,018				150,000	2,880,018
NEW JERSEY	57,901,908	4,240,299	775,811	14,106		2,279,340	65,211,464	1,819,858	61,277,454	1,739,360	63,016,814	17,380	1,734,060	1,751,440	619,557	63,857,795
NEW MEXICO	7,393,140	142,050	137,077			203,440	7,875,707	150,000	9,079,296	299,317	9,378,613	241,367		241,367	150,000	9,620,340
NEW YORK	118,024,439	9,996,871	1,797,273	174,013		2,432,529	132,425,125	233,837,947	2,678,267	8,957,577	89,176	9,047,153	2,424,605	347,561,367
NORTH CAROLINA	31,799,961	2,139,204	577,820	173,568		1,341,409	36,032,062	16,954,769		2,892,153	30,323	2,892,473	584,230	59,807,142
NORTH DAKOTA	4,701,267	794,170	58,812	3,744		761,709	6,319,702	1,390,468		124,949		124,949	150,000	7,515,417
OHIO	67,750,813	7,134,937	873,414	146,181	131,666	3,116,670	79,153,681	43,553,511		1,344,440	13,444	1,357,884	543,677	34,911,401
OKLAHOMA	16,940,246	638,877	154,672	204,686	251,418	772,360	19,162,259	19,879,323		6,836	6,186	624,772	193,110	19,504,095
OREGON	8,706,633	1,139,499	140,633	77,624		341,762	10,406,151	150,000	12,440,147	652,371	13,092,518	112,991		112,991	150,000	13,205,109
PENNSYLVANIA	69,541,085	5,773,490	760,963	28,187	344,036	631,411	77,079,172	76,077,822	630,042	2,244,892	22,449	2,267,341	795,105	80,935,120
RHODE ISLAND	5,812,179	511,454	21,138	13,842	17,064	1,100	6,376,777	150,000	5,764,350			126,749		126,749	150,000	6,891,099
SOUTH CAROLINA	26,853,251	1,214,222	301,475	178,347	69,470	448,138	29,064,903	32,806,877		1,311,319	13,113	1,324,432	337,912	34,129,109
SOUTH DAKOTA	3,470,550	183,425	73,866	4,613		77,310	3,809,764	150,000	6,047,083	101,179	6,148,262	32,932		32,932	150,000	6,182,294
TENNESSEE	31,271,181	874,016	410,787	61,758	108,934	322,311	33,049,087	122,176	33,564,997		33,564,997	1,297,321	12,973	1,310,294	347,349	34,880,289
TEXAS	87,675,714	3,154,801	996,869	307,301	116,754	1,914,657	94,166,096	94,167	95,078,083		95,078,083	2,407,922	24,079	2,432,001	961,446	97,510,084
UTAH	4,401,337	403,176	76,774	4,477		263,961	5,149,725	150,000	5,741,104	148,993	5,890,097	44,548		44,548	150,000	5,934,645
VERMONT	1,961,977	151,010	83,445	6,168		145,348	2,347,948	3,251,186	966,412		4,217,598	29,070		29,070	150,000	3,447,668
VIRGINIA	31,332,692	1,091,845	340,688	169,297		776,917	33,711,439	341,014	34,585,433		34,585,433	1,016,609	10,166	1,026,795	353,240	35,677,248
WASHINGTON	13,134,927	1,268,534	367,776	98,761		1,393,331	16,263,329	80,947	19,255,383	946,568	20,201,951	267,880	2,679	270,559	193,326	20,472,310
WEST VIRGINIA	17,719,813	475,961	128,401	30,000	21,470	206,315	18,581,960	83,194	8,477,297	63,907	8,541,204	548,461	5,484	553,945	189,428	19,187,451
WISCONSIN	16,709,476	2,195,568	477,961	37,568	43,779	579,956	20,044,308	211,649	22,164,345	1,513,568	23,677,913	347,776	3,478	351,254	227,937	24,029,191
WYOMING	1,186,164	227,053	49,977			197,511	1,660,705	150,000	1,806,183	163,917	1,970,100				150,000	1,970,100
DIST. OF COLUMBIA	13,194,911	668,774	162,786		51,810		14,078,281	150,000	12,617,641		12,617,641	543,709		543,709	150,000	13,181,350
BIA	16,688,198						16,688,198		16,688,198		16,688,198					16,688,198
AMERICAN SAMOA	160,351						160,351	25,000	187,365						25,000	185,365
GUAM	1,012,913	70,808					1,083,721	25,000	1,048,721						25,000	1,048,721
PUERTO RICO	30,796,813	773,431	44,214	231,108			31,845,566	312,434	31,837,390						312,434	31,837,390
TRUST TERRITORIES	1,152,969						1,152,969	25,000	1,177,995						25,000	1,177,995
VIRGIN ISLANDS	468,827		12,877				481,704	25,000	549,704						25,000	549,704

National Advisory Council on Education of Disadvantaged — 185,000
Undistributed — 13,295

1/ $1,400,000 of this amount reserved for the Migrant Student Record Transfer System.

PERCENT OF REVENUE RECEIPTS BY SOURCE – NEA
(for Education)

1975-76	Federal	State	Local & Other
TOTALS			
1. Alabama	16.1	63.6	20.3
2. Alaska	15.9	66.0	18.1
3. Arizona	10.3	45.7	44.0
4. Arkansas	16.1	51.4	32.5
5. California	11.1	35.3	53.7
6. Colorado	6.8	39.8	53.4
7. Connecticut	4.7	31.0	64.3
8. Delaware	9.3	68.6	22.1
9. District of Columbia	17.8	–	82.2
10. Florida	10.8	51.9	37.3
11. Georgia	11.9	58.2	29.9
12. Hawaii	10.4	85.1	4.5
13. Idaho	10.3	49.0	40.7
14. Illinois	6.5	48.4	45.2
15. Indiana	6.1	39.2	54.7
16. Iowa	4.1	40.3	55.7
17. Kansas	8.2	43.2	48.6
18. Kentucky	13.2	56.6	30.3
19. Louisiana	17.5	55.7	26.8
20. Maine	8.1	45.5	46.5
21. Maryland	7.3	42.7	50.0
22. Massachusetts	4.1	23.5	72.4
23. Michigan	7.7	36.2	56.1
24. Minnesota	5.5	54.7	39.7
25. Mississippi	21.5	54.4	24.0
26. Missouri	8.1	35.3	56.6
27. Montana	6.1	57.6	36.3
28. Nebraska	8.8	22.7	68.5
29. Nevada	5.5	38.8	55.8
30. New Hampshire	6.0	9.4	84.6
31. New Jersey	4.4	29.2	66.4
32. New Mexico	22.9	59.6	17.5
33. New York	4.8	39.6	55.6
34. North Carolina	13.7	65.6	20.7
35. North Dakota	9.3	45.3	45.3
36. Ohio	6.5	39.7	53.8
37. Oklahoma	11.7	51.1	37.2
38. Oregon	5.6	27.1	67.3
39. Pennsylvania	9.1	47.0	43.9
40. Rhode Island	7.9	35.9	56.2
41. South Carolina	15.2	55.6	29.2
42. South Dakota	13.4	13.2	73.3
43. Tennessee	12.7	48.3	39.0
44. Texas	10.6	50.1	39.3
45. Utah	8.0	53.5	38.6
46. Vermont	7.0	28.2	64.8
47. Virginia	10.5	30.5	59.0
48. Washington	7.4	65.2	27.4
49. West Virginia	12.1	56.5	31.4
50. Wisconsin	4.4	35.5	60.1
51. Wyoming	6.5	31.6	61.9
52. American Samoa			
53. Guam			
54. Puerto Rico			
55. Trust Territory			
56. Virgin Islands			

COUNCIL MEMBERS

	Term of Office
Dean Owen F. Peagler, Chairman New York, N.Y.	1978
Dr. Wilbur H. Lewis, Vice Chairman Tucson, Arizona	1978
Mrs. Carol Schwartz, Vice Chairman Washington, D.C.	1977
Dr. John Calhoun Wheaton, Maryland	1979
Mrs. Mary Anne Clugston Waterflow, New Mexico	1977
Mr. J. Alan Davitt Delmar, New York	1978
Mrs. Dorothy M. Fleegler Boca Raton, Florida	1978
Mrs. Sarah M. Greene Knoxville, Tennessee	1978
Mrs. Barbara Kilberg McLean, Virginia	1979
State Senator John Leopold Honolulu, Hawaii	1979
Mrs. Rosella Lipson Beverly Hills, California	1977
Mr. Marvin Pomerantz Des Moines, Iowa	1979
Dr. Ben Reifel Sioux Falls, S. D.	1977
Dr. George Willeford Austin, Texas	1977
Mr. M. Alan Woods Alexandria, Virginia	1979

Mrs. Roberta Lovenheim
Executive Director